

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXI

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 16, 1935

NUMBER 1050

Contents

The Week	259
Editorials	
Mr. Roosevelt's New Order.....	262
The Yellow (Journalist) Peril.....	263
Is There a Student Movement in America?.....	264
General Articles	
Facts About Faces: II. John Strachey..Peggy Bacon	265
Security for Americans: VII.....George Soule	266
Mr. Hearst Sees Red.....Hamilton Basso	269
Wanted—an American Composer...Irving Kolodin	272
Washington Notes.....T. R. B.	274
Lusus Naturae (verse).....Janet Ramsay	275
Other People's Money.....John T. Flynn	275
On the Labor Front.....William P. Mangold	276
A Communication.....John and Barbara McCurdy	277
Correspondence	280
Books in Review	
The Smart Set Legend.....Malcolm Cowley	281
Mr. Wilder in the Middle West...Edmund Wilson	282
Poet of New England.....Horace Gregory	283
Detour to the Dead Sea.....Norbert Guterman	283
The Epic of Peru.....Jonathan Mitchell	284
Books in Brief.....	284

The Week

CONSERVATIVE opponents of the New Deal are making too much, in our opinion, of the fact that the Supreme Court has declared unconstitutional those sections of the National Industrial Recovery Act dealing with the interstate shipment of "hot oil"—oil produced in excess of the state quotas. The Court's conclusions by no means invalidate the rest of the N.I.R.A., or the other phases of the Roosevelt program. The criticism of the oil provisions is that Congress abdicated its legislative power to the President by failing to state explicitly what was the purpose of the restrictions on interstate commerce it authorized him to make, and by failing to establish standards of fact by which the President's discretion was to be limited. These objections can be met without great difficulty; they might not have arisen had the oil curb not been jammed through at the last minute as a section of the N.I.R.A., after Congress had failed to pass a separate measure. The real question about New Deal legislation is not whether it is constitutional, but whether it is wise.

merely a futile compromise that can only delay a coming breakdown.

WHEN nations accuse one another of crimes, they do not speak out directly. There are certain niceties of circumlocution to be observed. Soviet Russia, in charging Germany with ultimate responsibility for the murder of Sergei Kirov, has done so with proper diplomatic finesse. Editorials have appeared simultaneously in Pravda and Izvestia hinting that the "consul of a small power" (G. W. Bisenieks of Latvia), who is supposed to have paid the assassins, had behind him a greater power which is opposed to communism on principle (Germany). The evidence brought forward by the Moscow papers to support this charge, up to now, is pretty flimsy. Leonid Nikolaev, the chief assassin, is reported to have said he killed Kirov on personal grounds; and the Russians point, as proof of Germany's guilt, to the fact that the German papers accept this explanation. What seems more likely is that the Russians have better evidence of German complicity but are afraid to publish it at this moment, for fear of provoking a war. It will be interesting to see what reply Hitler makes to the charge now publicly made against him—interesting, but not important, for the world long ago lost all faith in his solemnly pledged "word of honor."

NO SENATORIAL committee has ever performed a more useful public work than the one investigating the munitions business. Its funds are now exhausted, while much of its most important work is still to come. Senator Nye has asked for another \$100,000 to continue the work, and we trust that Congress will promptly grant his plea. No Congressman can vote against the appropriation without putting himself under the suspicion of benefiting, directly or indirectly, from the munitions business—surely one of the foulest that ever encumbered the earth.

THE Nazis have made every effort to conceal the real purpose of the dramatic meeting in the former State Opera House in Berlin, but there is little doubt as to what it meant. It was called to circumvent a smoldering revolt of Reichswehr officers

of the Reichswehr, have been demanding an investigation of the reasons for killing him. Undoubtedly one of the chief reasons for the meeting was to assure the Reichswehr that von Schleicher was innocent, and that his murderers have been punished. Undoubtedly, also, all intelligent people know that the "murderers" who have been punished were just about as guilty as the supposed "incendiaries" who set fire to the Reichstag. The real significance of the meeting is the growing power of the Reichswehr in Germany. Today it is in full command of all military matters, while the S. A. and S. S. remain as merely decorative adjuncts of Nazi power. Under such circumstances, it will be content to leave political affairs to Hitler, and the hopes cherished in some quarters that it might be the instrument of his overthrow vanishes into the limbo of so many similar hopes in the past.

THE first reports from Rome regarding the Franco-Italian understanding showed more optimism than the outcome of these negotiations seems to warrant. The French Foreign Minister's journey to Rome had two objectives. There was first the question of underwriting Austria's independence through guarantees by France, Italy and Great Britain. Paris and Rome have reached an agreement. They have given each other a mutual promise to respect Austrian national sovereignty and to settle, by further discussion, all controversies that may arise over this question. An effort will be made to include Germany in this understanding. The presence of von Hasse, the German Ambassador in Rome, at the discussions between M. Laval and Mussolini can be explained in no other way. Berlin would have readily consented had France agreed to legalize German rearming. Since such an agreement was impossible, France and Italy united in reiterating the Five-Power declaration of 1932. Germany, meanwhile, remained aloof. The chief difficulty in the Franco-Italian negotiations was the question of the Balkan states' participation in the Austrian guarantee. Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Yugoslavia and Poland, the anti-revisionist states, have always favored a Danubian understanding, but Hungary, Austria and Bulgaria, the revisionist states, are unwilling to enter upon a pact that might be interpreted as an official acceptance of their territorial losses. Rome seems to have made no progress in this regard. The semi-official communiqué merely speaks of the necessity of laying the decisions of the conference before the interested nations for examination and approval.

THE second half of the discussion between the French Foreign Minister and the Italian Premier turned on the question of Italy's African possessions. England and France, it will be remembered, bought Italy's entry into the World War with promises of an extension of her colonial empire. These promises

definitely agreed upon. In the present situation Rome sees her opportunity. France after previous conversations with Great Britain, has agreed to cede to Italy a large part of French Somaliland and to leave Abyssinia, with its gold and platinum mines, to Rome's tender mercies. In other words, the imperialists of Europe will come to an understanding about their colonial possessions and the African states and tribes will pay the bill. The guiding spirits in the League of Nations reduce the immediate danger of war in Europe by producing new diplomatic conflicts on the "dark continent." The Duce's warning "not to believe that everything has been done and nothing remains to be done" seems under the circumstances wholly justified. France and Italy have come to a temporary understanding—that is the fruit of Laval's visit to Rome.

THE National Industrial Conference Board is bitterly hostile to the New Deal and all its works; any statistics that this board puts forward are certainly not colored to favor Mr. Roosevelt. In the light of this fact, there is interesting material in its study of the cost of government, just published. From this study we learn:

That the net public debt of the federal government in the year 1934 was only \$300,000,000 larger than in 1919.

That total taxes collected were smaller in 1932 than in any other year since 1925. They of course represented an increased share of the national income, because that income had shrunk.

That federal taxes in 1932 were only about the same percentage of the national income that they were in 1923, '24, '26 or '27. The sharp increases have been in state and local taxes. Both these types of taxes take a percentage of national income about three times as great as it was ten years ago.

That the per-capita public debt of the United States, before dollar devaluation, was about one-third that of Great Britain, and about five-eighths that of France.

These figures are not excessively cheerful; but they are far more so than most of the current talk about ruinously high federal taxes and the imminent danger of currency inflation. Great Britain has gone a great deal deeper into the hole than we have, and survived. It is just possible that we might do the same.

THE steel industry is again entering the courts to fight collective bargaining. Unlike the Weirton case, however, the fight this time is going to be conducted along lines that will make the steel corporation formally a mere onlooker. The fight will be staged ostensibly between company-union workers and outside-union workers, with the government on the side of the latter. On December 31 the Steel Labor Relations Board ordered government-supervised elections to be held in Carnegie Steel Company plants at Duquesne, Pennsylvania, and McDonald, Ohio. For the purpose of these elec-

with payroll records. The deadline for compliance was set for January 7. On that date representatives of the company union petitioned Pennsylvania and Ohio circuit courts to prevent such elections on the ground that "there is no unrest" and that "it is not in the public interest to hold elections." The petition insists further that the company has not refused to bargain with the outside union for those of the employees who care to be represented by them. The obvious effort of this provision, of course, is to establish proportional representation.

IN THE meantime, the Amalgamated Organization in Duquesne is collecting among its members pay envelopes of a given date, which, together with a petition signed by the same workers, will be offered to the Board to be used in lieu of the payroll as a basis for an election. The envelopes bear the date of payment and the workers' names and check numbers. It is doubtful whether the Board will recognize these envelopes as sufficiently authentic. If it does not, the workers will probably call a strike as soon as they can organize their forces. There appears to be a strong determination on the part of the rank and file not to wait upon the courts to decide their fate.

THE Treasury still stands by its archaic position that books giving instructions on birth control are obscene and therefore inadmissible to a country that can take "Ulysses" without batting too many eyelids and can tolerate "stripper" and "teaser" acts in every burlesque house. Among a batch of books and magazines recently seized by the Customs and found improper by the Treasury experts are "Biological and Medical Aspects of Contraception," a collection edited by Margaret Sanger; "Therapeutic Contraception," by Dr. Hannah M. Stone, and an article by Marie C. Stopes. In the same group was "The Rhythm of Sterility and Fertility in Women" by Leo J. Latz, a book containing precise instructions in the rhythm method of birth control. Quite properly, the Customs service lumped it along with the others, but the Treasury expert decided otherwise and gave this book a *nihil obstat*. It may, of course, be irrelevant that the Catholic Church approves of the rhythm method. It may also be irrelevant that the very precise instructions in the rhythm method don't happen to work any too well. We hope the importer whose books were seized can take the matter to court and find out the reason for the government's curious preference among methods of birth control.

SO LITTLE news regarding the living conditions of the Japanese peasants comes to this country that even the smallest item assumes unusual importance. During the past few weeks, however, sufficient information has appeared in the British press to indicate that the situation in Japan, particularly in its rural districts, is rapidly mounting to a crisis

by the Tokyo Minister of Agriculture admits that during the first half of 1934 there were no less than 2,594 open conflicts with the peasants. The fall in prices has practically ruined the two million Japanese who live by silkworm production. The rice they grow on the land not used for silkworms is sufficient for only a few months. It is their custom, in the spring, to buy rice with the money they receive for their silkworms. Last year, however, after they had paid their taxes and a few of their debts, there was no money left for rice. The Manchester Guardian gives this description of conditions—which, it should be added, is summarized from a report in a leading Tokyo paper:

Farmers are unable to get their rice and are selling their daughters into slavery. . . . There are many who have nothing to eat except soup prepared from a small quantity of cheap grain and bark of trees. . . . Horse-chestnuts are being gathered for food during the winter. . . . Old people and children are to be seen everywhere gnawing plant roots. . . . The reports speak of large numbers of girls who are selling themselves into prostitution to save their families. . . .

These facts, few as they are, shed considerable light on the conflict between the military and naval authorities and those other politicians who are now urging, or making the pretense of urging, the reduction of armament expenses in order to provide sums for agricultural relief.

COMPTROLLER O'Connor has just issued a glowing, but generalized, statement on the healthy condition of the national banks. The annual reports of eight of the greater banks of New York show increases in surplus and undivided profits (after the payment of dividends) of ten million dollars and increases in deposits of more than one billion—the latter an increase of over 25 percent. It might seem curious in comparison to observe in the report of Joseph A. Broderick, bank superintendent of New York and chairman of the State Banking Board, recommendations that amount in substance to the indefinite continuance of bankers' martial law. The requirement that banks must render quarterly public statements is still to be suspended. Maximum interest rates on deposits are still to be fixed by decree. Nor is this enough; the Banking Board must be given discretionary power to limit withdrawals.

DESPITE the recovery steps of the federal government—loans, preferred-stock subscriptions, deposit insurance, a vast spending program—the mass of banks in the leading financial state are still unable to function normally. Obviously, their resources are frozen and the capital of many must be impaired, otherwise there would be no sense in forbidding the competitive bidding for deposits that would occur if interest rates were set at the discretion of individual banks. Meanwhile the large increase in deposits that results from the government's

hind that program. The theory was that if bank deposits rose the banks must start lending and a cycle of expanding credit would inevitably lead to expanding business. Unfortunately the banks that are now getting the deposits are those that could expand their loans—via Reserve credit—without them, and the banks that do need the deposits don't get them.

THE New Republic is moving its offices. Beginning at once, its address will be 40 East Forty-ninth Street, New York City.

Mr. Roosevelt's New Order

WHAT IS the "new economic order" that President Roosevelt forecasts in the first part of his message to the new Congress? There are, in this section, many fair words such as we have come to expect from the President in his public statements. Piecemeal reforms have been, he says, confusing and insufficient. Old inequalities have not changed. "In spite of our efforts and in spite of our talk, we have not weeded out the overprivileged and we have not effectively lifted the underprivileged." Though he reaffirms an intention to retain the profit motive, he defines the profit motive as "the right by work to earn a decent livelihood for ourselves and our families." If that be the profit motive, it is the main objective of millions of propertyless workers who never will see a cent of dividends, and is indeed an actuality in Soviet Russia. On the other hand, we must, he says, "forswear that conception of the acquisition of wealth which, through excessive profits, creates undue private power over private affairs and, to our misfortune, over public affairs as well." That sounds pretty good, though "excessive" and "undue" are weasel words.

Having had experience with Mr. Roosevelt's words in the past, however, we prefer to judge his action by the measures he actually proposes. And it is with these that the latter part of his message, as well as the budget message, are chiefly concerned.

He promises social legislation on unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, and the like. Though the details are not set forth in this message, they will probably resemble closely the inadequate program forecast in the article by George Soule on page 266 of this issue. There is no provision in the budget for any federal aid to such funds, unless he diverts some of the relief appropriation to these ends. But, even if he does that, he evidently contemplates no permanent governmental contribution, because he is firm on the point that the federal government must get out of relief as soon as possible. This program, therefore, is distinctly not one of redistributing income in behalf of the underprivileged by tapping excessive profits.

For the rest, he proposes a new program of un-

enterprise by its own efforts restores the old order, absorbs the unemployed and makes it possible for the federal government to stop paying relief and balance the budget. While the big financial and industrial interests with whom Mr. Roosevelt has reached a compromise often talk as if they wanted the government to retire at once from relief and balance the budget immediately, they know this is impossible. They have suggested that the government minimize its expenditures for the unemployed by a straight dole instead of work relief, which is more expensive. This suggestion the President declines to accept. On every other point, however, and on the ultimate aim, he is at one with them. The old order of private enterprise is what he really is working to restore.

What is this relief program? Out of approximately 10,000,000 unemployed Americans, about 5,000,000 are now on relief. Mr. Roosevelt makes the rash assumption that this number will not be enlarged. Of these, 1,500,000, assumed to be unemployable, will be transferred back to local charity. Many localities have no funds to care for them, and local poor relief is, on the whole, unsatisfactory from every point of view. These people will be treated as paupers by politics-ridden authorities under statutes but little in advance of the Elizabethan poor-law system. The remaining 3,500,000 Mr. Roosevelt intends to employ on federal public works. For this purpose he asks an appropriation of \$4,000,000,000 in the new budget. Outside of this relief fund, the budget will be in balance.

Seven conditions are set up for work relief:

1. The works must be permanently useful.
2. Wages are to be less than those paid by private employers, so that private employment will attract the workers away as rapidly as jobs are available.
3. The projects should use as large as possible a proportion of direct labor.
4. Self-liquidating projects are to be preferred.
5. They should compete as little as possible with private enterprise, being used for relief purposes mainly.
6. The works should be capable of being tapered off as private employment enlarges.
7. They should be located where there is the most unemployment, and the program of the National Resources Board should be used in their selection.

These conditions are mutually contradictory, and can lead to little along the line of Mr. Roosevelt's expressed intention to provide such things as good housing, extension of rural electrification, development of land and water resources.

Decent housing, for instance, is permanently useful and may be partially self-liquidating. It will, however, be attacked by real-estate interests as being competitive with private enterprise; it will involve large expenditures for land and materials; and it cannot be tapered off and left unfinished at

building workers lower wages than they get in private construction: the builders themselves would object to that.

Erosion control and forestry projects will use a large proportion of labor as compared with materials, and will be non-competitive with private enterprise, but they will not be self-liquidating and cannot be located where the majority of the unemployed exist.

The use of the unemployed on work for which they are trained would militate against any other method of selecting projects and would surely involve competition with private industry; while their use on work for which they are untrained would be inefficient and would lead to high costs. You cannot, for instance, employ steel-mill and automobile workers effectively on building construction or on the erection of electric transmission lines. If you did, any attempt to make these projects self-liquidating would be absurd.

Finally, if you spread \$4,000,000,000 in one year over 3,500,000 persons, assuming that it will all be spent in a year and assuming that not more than 40 percent of the sum is required for materials and equipment—a percentage lower than that now found in all but a few industries—you have an annual wage for those on relief of \$688, or about \$13 a week. There are families dependent on most of those on relief.

Clearly, this program can lead to little of the permanent security that Mr. Roosevelt promises in the line of a planned development of our resources, or a big housing plan. It is a confused makeshift, a minimum to stave off mass starvation while the government waits for old-fashioned revival by old-fashioned capitalism. And we suppose that if business revival fails this year as it has for so many years previously, business will find an excuse in the fact that the government spent this \$4,000,000,000.

The Yellow (Journalist) Peril

IF THE description, in this issue, of William Randolph Hearst's attack on academic freedom is not enough to convince our readers that he is trying to create a Red scare, we submit as additional evidence his address made over the National Broadcasting System on January 5. Beginning with the Kirov assassination and the resultant executions, he attempted to picture Soviet Russia as seething with rebellion and then, getting down to the business at hand, he lashed out at those who are seeking social change in the United States. Mr. Hearst's own words are the best description of his address.

Does anybody want the bloody despotism of communism in free America except a few incurable malcontents, a few sap-headed college boys and a few unbalanced professors? . . . The truth is that government by the proletariat, government by the least

community—government by the mob, by ignorance and avarice, by tyranny and terrorism—is the fearful failure that it needs must be and definitely deserves to be. . .

If these wild words had been spoken by a person of lesser influence, they might be dismissed as the inconsequential ravings of a frightened and misinformed numbskull. When spoken by Mr. Hearst, however, they become a source of truly terrible danger. Through his newspapers he can reach millions of people throughout America. These millions, confused and bewildered by five years of depression, can be further bewildered into supporting Mr. Hearst in his campaign of extermination. This is what happened in Germany, and Hitler, in his wildest moments, was no wilder on this subject than Mr. Hearst. Such a campaign is certain to be directed, of course, not merely against the few professed revolutionaries, but against all who want any change that Mr. Hearst does not want.

Already these fascist seeds are bearing fruit. Shortly after The Syracuse Journal opened the Hearst attack upon college professors there appeared in The Grand Rapids, Michigan, Press an editorial entitled, "Reds at Ann Arbor." Still following the lead of The Syracuse Journal, the editorial demanded an investigation of the faculty of the University of Michigan, declaring it was "no place for those teachers who are enthusiastic about spreading the Russian Gospel in a subversive way." The Grand Rapids Press is not a Hearst paper but the policy of its owners, the Booth Publishing Company, in this instance closely resembles that of Mr. Hearst. The Booth group owns eight newspapers, all in Michigan, and it is fair to assume that they are all likely to join in the Red hunt.

Meanwhile, we can report two heartening developments—the formation of a united front among educators, as described in our article, "Mr. Hearst Sees Red," and the beginnings of a similar action among college editors throughout the country. A resolution is now in the hands of some forty such editors, awaiting their signatures, condemning Mr. Hearst's scare and the "super-patriotic, fraudulent devices he is employing to achieve his ends." We think there is good reason to expect a large number of these college editors to sign the resolution, especially since it is only an elaboration of a similar statement (which, however, did not mention the publisher by name) signed by thirty-seven editors after attending a Hearst-inspired conference in Washington and New York, a short time ago. Incidentally, this conference remains among the country's unsolved mysteries. Why did Mr. Hearst decide to pay the bills for such an expensive proceeding? What in the world was the matter with the editors, that they should have unblushingly taken the money of a man who stands for everything in journalism to which college men should be opposed? And in particular, what is the matter with the editor of the Stanford University daily, who said

Is There a Student Movement in America?

THE FEELING of dissatisfaction with which many young Americans regard existing social institutions was clearly reflected at the four student conferences that took place during the Christmas holidays—those of the Student League for Industrial Democracy, the National Student League, the National Conference of Students in Politics and the National Student Federation of America. To discover the generators of the most radical sentiment among students, however, one had to attend the annual meetings of the Student League for Industrial Democracy and the National Student League, in the Midwest.

Both organizations together do not have a membership of more than 7,000, although some 50,000 students followed their leadership in the anti-war strike organized by these two groups last April. The Student L.I.D., as the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, was organized in 1905 by Jack London, Upton Sinclair, Clarence Darrow and others. Smashed by the War, it reorganized as the League for Industrial Democracy, the student groups of which formed the Student L.I.D. in 1933. Today it is predominantly socialist in sympathy, but with many liberals and communists in its ranks. The National Student League was organized in 1932 by students, mostly communists, who are dissatisfied with the L.I.D. It began by organizing a student expedition down into Harlan, Kentucky, and followed this with a capably led student strike at Columbia against the expulsion of the editor of *The Columbia Spectator*. The Student L.I.D. and the N.S.L. work together under the terms of a pact for united action with respect to the issues of war and the R.O.T.C., retrenchment, discrimination against the Negro student, vigilantism and academic freedom.

When these two organizations got behind the National Conference of Students in Politics a year ago, the sessions were well attended and the debate was acrimonious but lively. Having been accused of stacking the Conference, the N.S.L. and Student L.I.D. this year sent only a nominal number of representatives. So few others turned up that the Conference, which last year started auspiciously with the blessings of many groups, voted to liquidate itself.

The sessions of the yearly meeting of the National Student Federation of America in Boston showed to what extent the ideas of the N.S.L. and L.I.D. are affecting the ideas of other students. There were 200,000 of them represented by their councils at this meeting. Last year the N.S.F.A. voted that faculty control of the undergraduate press was a good thing, and came near to excluding the Negro delegates from its ball. This year its

academic freedom at Louisiana State University, the University of California in Los Angeles and the City College of New York. The Federation this year came out against compulsory drill, and asked for the reopening of the Hamilton-Reynolds compulsory-military-training case recently adjudicated by the United States Supreme Court. While it did not endorse the student strike against war, set for the fifth of April, neither did it condemn it. When Hearst's so-called newspaper men tried to get N.S.F.A. officials to say they would participate in a campaign to root out undergraduate radicals, they condemned Mr. Hearst's Red-baiting. President MacCracken of Vassar urged the N.S.F.A. to consider itself in the category of a trade union representing students in their relations with college administrations and boards of trustees. It is questionable, nevertheless, whether the responsibility for collective bargaining can be vested in a group, the majority of whose members are still merely provincial campus politicians.

Is there a student movement in America? Certainly there is a great stir and departure from traditional points of view. But our student movement has an elderly quality about it. Its passionless slogans seem to be dictated by old men. Its congresses pass long resolutions about child labor, federal relief, war expenditures, Negro discrimination, but few of the young men and women passing these resolutions seem to know just what sort of good life they want to be allowed to live. It is a movement of dissatisfaction with the old order of things motivated by no powerful vision of the new life. Indeed, the student radical who strikes against war is likely to be simultaneously a devoted reader of *The Saturday Evening Post*. There are in American colleges today thousands of restless young radicals whose pent-up energy awaits the release that can come only with the growth of a revolutionary political party. Only then can the energy now exerted in the fight against retrenchment, R.O.T.C., race discrimination and fascist tendencies be released so that American students may find more certain direction and immediate purpose in their activity.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1935, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.



Facts About Faces: II. John Strachey

Black, crinkly hair spreading away fanwise from broad brow and wide fat face, presenting and exposing the features on a cushion. Large full physiognomy, so to speak, smoothed, devoid of seams like a bursting wine-skin or a warm ruddy hot-water bottle. Long, floating eyebrows drifting vaguely over round brown Simple Simon eyes, reminiscent of something rising goofily through gallons of water from the ocean bottom. Projecting

with a slightly supercilious British sniff, lifting up a curly upper lip and baroque mouth with puffy, fungoid lips. Comfortable-looking chin upholstering face, resting easily on chest and swinging back pleasantly into shoulders without bothering about a neck. Big, easy frame and meditative, hairy hands. Personality mild, ample, effortless, abstractly inquisitive.

Security for Americans

VII: *Can We Provide Security?*

FOR A LONG time now people have been saying that perhaps the greatest evil of capitalist industrialism is not its unequal distribution of wealth but the insecurity it brings to the majority of the population. Free a man from worries about how to pay the grocer if he loses his job, how he and his wife are to live in their old age, or how the expenses of sickness can be met, and he would not care so much about less immediate types of injustice or inequality. Months ago the present administration boldly announced that it was going to attack this problem, and it has since been busy trying to draft legislation to express its purpose. The New Republic has attempted to prepare its readers for intelligent discussion of these proposals by printing a series of articles by authorities representing various attitudes toward the subject. It may be well now to review them briefly in order to bring together the main points at issue.

There is unanimous agreement that no legislation dealing with social insurance alone can go far toward the goal of providing security for all in a system subject to the ills and chances of ours. Unemployment insurance, for instance, cannot compensate those now out of jobs. Even in the future, it cannot cover all employees, and it will not yield benefits higher than a fraction of the going wage or for more than a few weeks out of a given year. Old-age pensions, while better than the poorhouse or ordinary poor-relief, cannot now be provided for more than those who are destitute or close to destitution, while a contributory insurance system for the future cannot help those who do not earn anything and so cannot contribute.

What, under these circumstances, should be the general principles of unemployment insurance? Here the argument seems to lie chiefly between the so-called Wisconsin and Ohio plans—the latter being not original with Ohio, of course, but an adaptation of the systems already tested in Great Britain and elsewhere. Ignoring minor differences, the chief distinction is that, under the Wisconsin law, a separate reserve fund is set up from the contributions of each employer, the rate of an individual employer's contributions to fall after his reserve per employee has reached \$55, and contributions to cease altogether after it has become \$75, while under the Ohio and other plans, the funds from all employers are pooled and all benefits paid from a general pool.

The main argument for the Wisconsin plan is that since it varies the net contribution of each em-

ployer provides an incentive on his part to regularize operations and thus to minimize the necessity for paying benefits. Each employer ought to be forced, according to this reasoning, to accept a part of the costs of supporting in idleness the labor which he requires only part of the time; supporting this labor is a social cost in any case, and it is better social accounting to have at least some of it attributed to the employer directly responsible. The main argument for the Ohio or more usual type of plan is that, by utilizing the insurance principle of distributing the risk, it makes possible higher benefits and longer terms of benefit. There is no denying that this is true.

The question is whether the Wisconsin plan is likely to be effective enough in stimulating more regular employment to overcome this disadvantage. That, in turn, depends upon how much unemployment arises from policies that the individual employer can alter. Admittedly some does. There are cases on record of ingenious manufacturers in seasonal industries discovering ways to minimize seasonal unemployment. Careful planning may in other cases diminish casual unemployment. But the serious bulk of unemployment is an incident of the business cycle, the depression phase of which employers dislike fully as much as do workers. Any additional penalty imposed by losing a small percentage of the payroll to compensate unemployed workers is a fleabite compared with the other losses of depression; it can scarcely stimulate an employer to do anything that he would not otherwise do to keep or restore prosperity. Of course depression can neither be avoided nor remedied by individual action. Next to depression, the most serious source of unemployment is the shifting of demand and the decline of whole industries or industrial regions, likewise not amenable to action by individuals. If we had abolished depressions and had made our society otherwise static, the Wisconsin plan might be preferable, but as things are, I believe it has much the worse of the argument.

The "workers' plan," embodied in the Lundeen bill and discussed in our pages by Mary van Kleeck, expresses the natural desire to receive full wages, not as a charity but as a right, during involuntary unemployment or sickness as long as it lasts, and to have the bill paid out of profits and large incomes rather than in a form such that it comes largely out of the workers themselves, as in the other plans. This is a neat way of mobilizing workers in support of an unquestionably just demand, which capitalist

ing, at least in periods of depression. It is merely another way of demonstrating that we ought to have a better economic system. While that is well worth doing, the plan can hardly be discussed as an alternative to the others.

The essential issue that the Lundeen bill raises—who shall bear the cost of security compensation—has been one of the most difficult practical problems in the whole discussion. The Wisconsin law puts the whole burden on employers in the form of a percentage of payroll, and most other plans include a similar employers' contribution. The assumption is that this will not ultimately come out of profits, but will be treated as a cost of production and passed on to the consumer, at least in large measure. Employers nevertheless maintain that the workers also should make a direct contribution, while labor protests at a levy against wages that already are inadequate. There is strong opinion that the government should contribute, for this not only would make possible larger benefits but would place at least part of the burden, through taxation, on large incomes and profits. But governments, state and national, do not want to submit to still another heavy drain on leaky budgets.

Paul Douglas, in his article on the relationship of unemployment insurance to relief, makes what seems to me a sensible suggestion on this point. Let the

insurance plan proper rest primarily upon payroll contributions. Let it be understood that payments out of this fund must be limited in order to preserve solvency. After insurance gives out, however, public relief, dependent ultimately upon taxes, must be called into play, as it is now. Let the national government face this indubitable fact, and make its contribution in the form of a fund that shall be used to continue the benefit payments up to a certain point, after unemployment reserves give out. These additional payments should be made as a matter of right, without any test of the need of the recipient, just as insurance benefits themselves are. Unemployed persons should not be subjected to the indignities of charity administration under the old poor-relief attitude, just because our society runs into a more severe crisis than insurance reserves can remedy. Recipients of such public expenditures may, however, justly be asked to do appropriate work on useful projects; giving them useful work will help preserve their morale. When the limits of the amount that the national government can be prevailed upon to contribute are reached, there will be no recourse except to turn those who still have the misfortune to be unemployed over to the tender mercies of local communities.

Reluctance of the federal government to be forced to make regular contributions to unemploy-

TYPICAL STATE AIDS TO WORKERS' SECURITY

The systems in various countries differ widely in type, in administration and in the proportion of workers covered; some nations, for instance, confine certain types of protection to certain industries, etc. In general, however, where the standards of a nation cover a large group of workers and are at least equal to the standards of the International

Labor Conference of 1919 an entry appears in the table. Where there is no entry, the system is far below these standards, covers very few workers, or does not exist at all.

Many nations not appearing in the table have one or more types of protection.

		ARGENTINA	AUSTRALIA	AUSTRIA	BELGIUM	CANADA	CZECHOSLOVAKIA	DENMARK	FRANCE	GERMANY	GREAT BRITAIN	ITALY	NETHERLANDS	NORWAY	SPAIN	SWEDEN	SWITZERLAND	U. S. A.	U. S. S. R.
Unemployment Insurance	A—Compulsory Contributory B—Voluntary		1	A	B		B	B	B	A	A	A	B	B	B		B		A
Old-Age Pensions	AA—Compulsory non-Contributory } Ins. A—Compulsory Contributory } B—Pension System, non-Contributory	2	B	2	A	B	A	B	A	A	A&B	A	A	B ³	A	A	A ⁴		AA
Health Insurance	AA—Compulsory State System, State Aid A—Compulsory System, no State Aid B—Voluntary, State Aid	B	5	A	B		A	B	AA	AA	AA	6	A	AA		B	AA ⁷		AA
Death Benefits				Yes			Yes			Yes				Yes			Yes ⁷		Yes
Maternity Benefits	A—Non-Contributory. No. of Weeks Cov'd. B—Contributory. No. of Weeks Covered.			A ₁₂			A ₁₂	A ₄	B ₁₂	A ₁₂		B ₄	A ₁₂	A ₁₂	A ₁₂	A ₁₂	A ₁₂		A ₁₆
Housing ⁸ Assistance	Approximate percentage of total post-war housing built directly by government			73			10	16		11	36		11	47		10			52

¹ The State of Queensland alone maintains a system, ratable A.

² Provided for by law but never established.

³ Financed by the municipalities, not the kingdom.

⁴ Three cantons only.

⁵ The State of New South Wales enforces a compulsory health insurance system, ratable A.

⁶ In former Austrian territory the compulsory health insurance of Austria has been continued.

⁷ Five cantons only.

⁸ Most of the countries having entries on the chart, and some of the others also, give aid to limited-dividend housing corporations either in the form of a loan or a grant.

ment reserves is one of the chief reasons why the administration has refused to consider a single, national insurance plan rather than mere encouragement to state plans. Although there is strong opinion among the experts that a national plan is preferable, and although support for this course exists in labor and even among influential employers, it has not been seriously considered by the President's Committee on Economic Security.

The case for a national plan is almost axiomatic: the markets for both goods and labor are in large degree national; competition is mainly on an interstate scale; the great corporations which administer the bulk of production and distribution are nationally controlled and the policies of others are decided on a nationwide basis; all the other elements of the New Deal legislation are embodied in national measures; a national scheme would make certain the inauguration of unemployment insurance promptly throughout the country; it would make possible a wider distribution of the risk and more adequate benefits when, as is often the case, certain regions are more heavily hit than others; and a national plan would make possible the essential knitting together of the various elements of a true security program, such as unemployment insurance, relief, old-age pensions and the rest.

The case against a national plan may be outlined—though by no means fully discussed in the space here available—under the following heads:

1. Speed of enactment: state legislatures are already meeting, ready to put through plans; something must be done to encourage them. (The answer is that not more than half the states at the outside are likely to pass a measure; we may spend a quarter-century getting the rest to do so and then another quarter-century obtaining an adequate national scheme to supersede the confusion of forty-eight different state schemes, each one of which will have developed a vested interest of its own.)

2. Necessity for experiment: states can try different plans and we can learn on a limited scale and without great risk of loss what their virtues and defects are. (Other countries have done already most of the needed experimenting. On their experiences we can build a fairly good national system. The only really new experiment proposed in this country is the Wisconsin plan, and we can predict almost certainly that, whatever its success, it will be inferior as an attack on the problem of security.)

3. Need of decentralized and local administration: a federal plan would be too big and unwieldy. (There is no proof whatever that state administration would, outside of exceptional instances, be better than federal. Administration of any new scheme is indeed a highly important matter, but would forty-eight separate administrations of insurance in a nationwide industrial system be any better than a single administration setting standards and decentralizing those functions that can better be handled

of the plan; therefore we must allow them to differ by states. (Unfortunately it is true that the experts cannot all agree, and that there are differences between labor and employers. Such controversies, however, precede almost all legislation and are customarily resolved by majority rule or by the decision of the responsible executives. If we waited for experts, capital and labor to become unanimous on any subject whatever, we should never try anything.)

5. Congress would not pass, and if it did the courts would declare unconstitutional, a national system. (Congress would pass almost anything in the line of security legislation that the administration favored. It may even pass measures to which the administration is opposed, such as the bonus bill, the thirty-hour week, the Townsend pension plan. Some, at least, of the experts on constitutional law believe that no good grounds exist for invalidating national unemployment-insurance legislation; if the Supreme Court should do so, it would be even more likely to wipe off the slate most of the other New Deal legislation.)

In spite of these considerations, the administration has apparently made up its mind to support a bill resting upon state systems. It will probably encourage state legislatures by a scheme similar to the Wagner-Lewis Bill penalizing employers by federal taxes in states that do not set up unemployment-insurance plans. It probably will not even adopt the suggestion to give grants-in-aid as an encouragement, because of its commitments toward budget balancing. And probably the standards it will set up for approval of state systems will be as lax as possible. All this, I believe, will in the future appear to have been a cardinal error.

We need not pause long on old-age pensions. Abraham Epstein, the leading authority on the subject, made plain in our pages that we need two interlocking systems—one an extension of the non-contributory pensions already existing in many states, to take better care of the destitute aged, the other a contributory scheme of annuities that will cover everyone who can afford to contribute and may come into operation in the future when reserves have reached a sufficient size. We need not expect much help in the form of federal funds for either of these plans, nor much enlargement of the existing pensions.

Health insurance was not discussed in our series, and apparently is being laid on the table by the administration. It is a large and complex subject, with which we hope to deal more adequately in the future. At present it must suffice to remark that many persons do not receive adequate medical service, that the burden of paying for it is unduly heavy on those of small income who still are not charity cases, that in spite of this many doctors themselves are victims of economic insecurity, that the reactionary attitude of the organized medical profession helps to prevent anything being done about it. Two

not solve the problem without some form of socialized medicine; (2) socialized medicine will not solve the problem unless our whole economic system provides the means of security for everybody.

What, in view of this brief survey, seems to be the conclusion? No other is possible than that the announced intention of the President to provide economic security boils away to very little.

The number of jobless still wavers about 10,000,000, or over one-fourth of those normally expecting employment. The index of industrial production has risen only to the neighborhood of 75, on the basis of 100 in 1923-25. In 1929, when we last had relatively full employment, it was 119. But production will have to be much higher than in 1929 if industry is to use as many workers as it did then, because in the meantime, on account of increased efficiency, output per labor hour has advanced more than 15 percent. Industry will have to use more workers than it did in 1929 to provide full employment, because the population has increased.

The major part of unemployment is in construction, the industries making capital and other durable goods, and the service industries depending upon them. What will revive these industries? Government spending on housing and public works can help, but only if it is greatly increased—increased more than political exigencies will allow it to be, because of fears of a too far unbalanced budget. In so far as public construction is not increased, the budget will continue to be unbalanced by relief expenditures. We can perhaps double our present

national debt without any heavier burden than now exists in Great Britain. Some day, however, relief dependent on borrowing will have to stop.

The other hope for building and the heavy industries is another construction and capital boom, accompanying a revival of private initiative. One may question whether this can come without much more deflation of existing debt-capital than has yet taken place. This depression is noteworthy among others of comparable severity for the small amount of bankruptcy that has occurred in the great industries. If, moreover, another boom does come, there is no assurance whatever that, like speculative booms in the past, it will not overshoot the mark and produce another crisis in which the moderate measures for security now suggested will be just as inadequate as they would have been this time.

The achievement of economic security is, in the end, nothing less than the achievement of a secure economy. That cannot be won by turning aside into by-paths. The best palliative measures that can possibly be devised ought to be adopted, out of pure concern for the unfortunate victims of collapse. But the patent and pathetic inadequacy of these measures ought to enforce concentration of our attention on the task of constructing an economy in which they would fill their rightful place. They can mop up around the edges and compensate for the inevitable defects of even the best system. But they cannot do much to mitigate the ills of an order that refuses to work.

GEORGE SOULE.

This is the final article in the series on Security for Americans.—THE EDITORS.

Mr. Hearst Sees Red

MR. WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST has been with us a very long time now, seventy-one years to be exact, and he has not spent those seventy-one years just diddling and fiddling around. He has built up a nice little newspaper business for himself and owns six or eight magazines and is altogether an important and successful man. He has reached the point now where, like all important and successful men, he can afford to take it easy and relax a bit and indulge in his hobbies.

One of his hobbies is collecting old castles and storing them away stone by stone in a warehouse somewhere, and another of his hobbies is his ranch in California where you can wave to kangaroos and elephants and other wild folk of the jungle as you ride along on his own private railroad, and still another of his hobbies is traveling. Mr. Hearst has been traveling a long time and has been all around the world, but it has lost none of its fascination for him. Every year he likes to go to

He likes to see new places and new things and perhaps find a castle to dismantle and send back home in crates. A few months ago he visited Germany. While in Germany he looked around to see how the Germans were getting along and then one day he went in to have a talk with Hitler. It was a case of two good talkers getting together, and while nobody knows just what they talked about, it was reported that they talked a long time.

Syracuse, New York, is a long way from Germany and perhaps Mr. Hearst's talk with Hitler had nothing to do with it, but not long after that conversation took place a Hearst reporter walked into the offices of Professor John N. Washburne of Syracuse University. He introduced himself, giving his name as Richard Smith, but he did not say he was a Hearst reporter. He said he was the Richard Smith who had written the professor about entering the university as a special student. He

itics—especially the Russian experiment. He intended to go to Russia next summer and wanted to take a few courses that would help him to understand the people and the country.

Professor Washburne was polite. He said that he too was interested in the Russian experiment. He recommended that Smith take two courses in Political Science, conducted by a professor who was quite liberal in his tendencies.

"Oh," the reporter said. "There are other liberals here?"

"Yes," Professor Washburne answered. "Syracuse has for years been one of the most liberal colleges in the country."

The professor and the supposed student continued their conversation. When Smith left he asked the professor to have lunch with him the next day. Professor Washburne was not impressed with his would-be student but Smith pressed the invitation so urgently that finally he accepted.

When Smith appeared for lunch the next day a second member of The Syracuse Journal's staff, Gordon Druehl, accompanied him. Druehl was introduced as a draftsman in Syracuse on business concerning the new elevated railroad. When they went out to lunch the two young conspirators began shooting questions at the professor. What were his political affiliations? Was he a Communist? If he wasn't a Communist what was he? What did he think of the Constitution? Could a successful revolution be accomplished without force?

The young men from The Journal had by this time drunk a couple of bottles of red wine and they became very fierce and revolutionary indeed. Smith was not only a Communist, and one of the first ten ranking Communists at that, but he had laid widespread plans for a revolution that just couldn't miss. He had corrupted all the police and National Guardsmen, maybe with Moscow gold, and he had also knocked down five grand by smuggling poison gas into Mexico. He was an old, old revolutionary, pregnant with dark deeds, and next to him Leon Trotsky looked like Little Red Riding Hood on the way to see her grandma who was so sick in bed.

This was on November 17. On the evening of November 22, The Journal screamed out in its headlines that Syracuse University was a hotbed of radicalism. On page one, under the headline "HERE IS THE GIST OF CONVERSATIONS HELD WITH PROFESSOR JOHN N. WASHBURNE," it gave what was supposed to be a word-by-word account of the "interview" by Smith and Druehl. Here is a sample of the reported conversation:

Washburne: Suppose you go up and see Doctor Crawford, the dean of the School of Education. He is very conservative so . . . give him the impression you are a conservative too. You look something like one.

Smith: Thanks. If you think so, ask the New York police.

Washburne: If you want to, you could tell Craw-

Smith: I am. . . . I believe it will be repeated here when this government is overthrown.

Washburne: (*Leaning forward and in a whisper*), SO DO I.

Professor Washburne immediately issued a statement denying most of the quotations attributed to him by The Journal, and The Syracuse Daily Orange, student newspaper, printed an editorial condemning The Journal for its tactics. The Journal replied with a two-column editorial, "Wanted—An Inquiry." The following quotation suggests its tone:

Another point the professors make is that The Journal was unethical in sending two investigators, who were really reporters, to interview them. We doubt if the professors would have talked at all if two reporters had interviewed them. When you go after bear you generally take a gun. . . . The Journal suggests that the board of trustees interrogate the following professors in order to determine whether any or all of them have a pink complex. . . .

There, for the time being, the situation in Syracuse was permitted to rest. But in New York City, on December 19, The New York American, another Hearst paper, published what was called an article by Richard Washburn Child, former United States Ambassador to Italy.

"Freedom of thought, freedom of speech, is an American tradition," wrote Mr. Child. "Today many of our colleges and schools are squirming with *un-American* movements coming from planted nests of green young *Communists* and flossy professors with a thousand ideas for the *destruction of capital!* . . . *Keep the boys and girls out of those institutions where investigation shows red degeneracy is found.* . . . *If parents would keep youth away from black plague spots, why not from red plague spots?*"

On the same day Mr. Child's article was published, two would-be students appeared at Columbia University. One of them went to call on Professor George S. Counts. The second knocked on the door of Professor William H. Kilpatrick. Both professors are members of the faculty of Teachers' College and both had received letters from supposed students declaring that the writers wanted to get into a college where they could get the real low-down on radical movements and revolutionary tactics. Professor Counts and Professor Kilpatrick had both heard about Professor Washburne and what had happened to him, and they were more than slightly suspicious. They arranged to have a stenographer present to make a complete, verbatim transcript of their conversations.

Professor Counts suggested to his visitor that they come out in the open. Wasn't he a Hearst reporter? The visitor admitted he was. He was on the staff of The New York Evening Journal. The letter he had sent to Professor Counts, he said, was written on orders from the city desk. He either had to do

"Mr. Hearst," he said, "is engaged at present in conducting a red scare. . . . You realize of course that because of my assignment I will have to select the most sensational statements from the interview in order to make out a good case. This is what Mr. Hearst is expecting."

In Professor Kilpatrick's office much the same thing happened. The second reporter also made a clean breast of it. He too was from The New York Evening Journal.

"I am in the peculiar position," he said, "of talking with you as a Red-baiter. Personally I am not in sympathy with that sort of thing, in fact quite the opposite, but Mr. Hearst wants to get material along this line."

Both reporters were given long interviews, in which Professor Counts and Professor Kilpatrick spoke very freely, but the interviews were never printed. Instead, the other New York Hearst paper, The American, turned its attack on New York University after it was reported that Professor Sidney Hook, of the faculty of N.Y.U., had been elected a national organizer of the Workers' Party of the United States and that Professor James Burnham was named one of the editors of The New International.

"Well! Gentlemen of the Faculty of New York University, trustees, alumni, students and everyone else who is a friend of New York University and proud of its history—" declaimed The American, "if the alleged action of these two professors has been correctly reported, what do you say to it? WHAT DO YOU PROPOSE TO DO ABOUT IT? Is this old and respected institution of learning to be classified hereafter as a seeding-ground for disloyalty to America and its cherished institutions—as an active center for treasonable plotting for the overthrow of the American government?"

Perhaps, as has been said before, it is only a coincidence that this vicious attempt to terrorize the teachers in American colleges and universities was made just a short time after Mr. Hearst and Mr. Hitler got together over their cups of tea. Perhaps it is only Mr. Hearst's great, burning, passionate patriotism that prompts him to attack the principles of free speech and free thought and to turn the men who work for him into sneaks and spies. There is no need to point out at this late date what a great patriot Mr. Hearst is. All you have to do is to remember the Maine.

Of course the fact remains that Mr. Hearst has been given a severe case of colic by many of the features of Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal. The idea of having professors in the administration, and liberal professors at that, is so repugnant to him that it might easily cause him to attack even the most innocently liberal professors everywhere. It is Mr. Hearst's notion that if it were not for the liberals in the administration there would be no Section 7a and if there were no Section 7a there would be no Dean Jennings case—which Mr.

Hearst, who believes in the freedom of the press, is fighting with all the power and influence he can command.

The professors, however, are not going to take it lying down. A movement is afoot to have Mr. Hearst brought before the McCormack-Dickstein Committee investigating un-American activities; and a boycott of all Hearst newspapers by teachers throughout the country is threatened. The McCormack-Dickstein Committee ceased functioning with the opening of Congress but the professors are trying to have its period of life extended. In a statement to the committee it was declared: "If William Randolph Hearst succeeds in his efforts, he will reduce American universities and schools to the ignominious condition of the German schools and universities under Hitler. Is this the beginning of a nationwide fascist campaign to destroy our basic American freedoms? . . . The American people have a right to know."

The statement to the Committee is signed by:

Charles A. Beard, former president of American Historical Association; John Dewey, professor emeritus, Columbia University and honorary president of the National Education Association; William H. Kilpatrick, professor of Philosophy, Teachers' College; George S. Counts, professor of Education, Teachers' College and chairman of the Progressive Education Association Committee on Economics and Sociology; Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor of Riverside Church and member of faculty of Union Theological Seminary.

Howard L. McBain, dean of Graduate Faculties, Columbia University; William C. Bagley, professor of Education, Teachers' College; George W. Kirchwey, Dean Emeritus, Columbia Law School; E. C. Lindeman, New York School for Social Research; Karl N. Llewellyn, professor of Jurisprudence, Columbia University; Howard Nudd, secretary of the Public Education Association of New York; John L. Childs, professor of Education, Teachers' College.

Robert K. Speer, professor of Education, New York University; Jesse H. Newlon, director of Lincoln School, Teachers' College, and former president of the National Education Association; Robert B. Raup, professor of Education, Teachers' College; Joseph K. Hart, formerly of Vanderbilt University and associate editor of The Survey; Heber Harper, professor of Education, Teachers' College; Rollo G. Reynolds, principal of Horace Mann School and professor of Education of Teachers' College; Willard W. Beatty, president of the Progressive Education Association; Clyde R. Miller, treasurer of the Progressive Education Association; Frederick L. Redefer, executive secretary of the Progressive Education Association.

It is impossible to predict what effect this protest will have. If it does nothing else, however, but to focus the attention of the country on what was obviously a carefully planned attack on American schools and colleges it will have served its purpose. Mr. Hearst, it would appear, underestimated the strength of the opposition. The embattled professors may get him yet.

Wanted—an American Composer

WHATEVER the present musical season may amount to in general quality, it is already apparent that contemporary American music is in for a larger share of attention than usual. In New York, the Philharmonic Symphony has engaged a conductor particularly to present such works (the obvious gesture of recognition for the public financing recently accomplished), and the League of Composers has further extended its benefits by obtaining performances in various parts of the country for works now being written by four prominent composers. While recognizing the good intentions behind these projects, their value seems to me at least dubious. I do not share the feeling that perhaps our audiences are not ready for this music; I would place the emphasis elsewhere—are the composers ready to be exhibited in this fashion?

Confine the question to works wholly of native origin, and there seems to be little available that has the qualities to absorb a neutral audience. For in turning away from homogeneous and receptive groups that have in the past formed the sounding-board for such works and addressing themselves directly to what musical public we possess, the propagandists for the native composer are setting up an entirely new set of conditions.

Without trying to define Americanism in art, it is easy to recognize that, for certain positive factors, such works as the lithographs of Bellows, the novels of Lewis, Fitzgerald, Dos Passos and Dreiser, the plays of O'Neill, the poetry of Masters and Donald Evans, the humor of Ed Howe, could have been created nowhere else than in contemporary America. But, in the literature of serious American music, it is largely from the negative factors, lacks and shortcomings that one can deduce such an origin.

There are two distinguished creative musicians, Ernest Bloch and Charles Martin Loeffler, among us at the moment. But they cannot really be called American composers. In England, Bloch is referred to as the "Swiss-Jewish" composer; and all of Loeffler's finely characteristic works could have been created in his native Alsace as well as in his American home in Medfield, Massachusetts. These men are no more American composers than Handel was an English one—in certain respects, considerably less so.

Characteristically, it is in the music least often heard today in the concert hall that one finds the nearest approach to indigenous qualities of the positive sort . . . the works of the group best represented by MacDowell and Chadwick. Traditionalists, unadventurous, they most certainly were; yet these were modes of thought in which they had become thoroughly integrated. What they gave forth

and weaknesses along with indubitable virtues. Had American music followed the course plotted by these men, it would have been in a far healthier condition today than is the case. But of the composers among us of whom as much can be said the number is indeed few, and, curiously, includes the lesser talents.

Thus, little as I find to admire in the music of Howard Hanson (he of last season's "Merry Mount" at the Metropolitan) there are in his work relationships to the earlier group in whom there was promise of a native speech. Sowerby is another; although the Italian critic who characterized a work of his as "*aqua di rosa*" said more about American music in three words than most of our commentators say in as many columns. The second symphony of Randall Thompson embodied such native qualities to a marked degree; and the internal opposition of our more advanced composers to this sort of honesty is reflected in their comment that this was not representative of the "real" Thompson. In Arthur Shepherd, too, such qualities can be discerned, although his stature as a composer is somewhat reduced by his devotion to the literary and technical aspects of music.

To quibble about details of speech and phrasing when there are larger issues involved seems like evading the basic consideration—whether or not these works possess absolute musical value—but there is little evidence to justify estimating our literature by such elevated standards. Further, it is a fact that every music of vitality bears upon it the stamps of a national identity. In the case of Teutonic music, the mark is so plain that it has become the symbol of European musical speech *per se*. But whether we look to Russia or Italy, France or Hungary, Spain, or lately even England, the composers whose works have possessed meaning for the hearers both within and without their national boundaries have been men in whom some large element of nationality has manifested itself. This reasoning is deductive, but the relationship exists and can be traced.

That no such relationship can be discerned in the mass of music being created here at the present time argues several things. It may, in the first place, signify that a fusion of elements so varied as those of this country is beyond the capacity of any but a genius whose like even European music has yet to see. Or, more pointedly, it may argue that our men have consciously rejected the dull virtues of their own soil for the glitter that radiates from the surface of contemporary European creations.

A patient listener finds that each new "American" work inclines him to the latter view. There is a precedent for this procedure, for Tchaikovsky, re-

garded by his Russian contemporaries as the most European of their group, yet stands for us today as typical in many ways of the essential Russian. In his music was manifested some extraordinary flow of his people, even when he was creating symphonic works of a mold and pattern wholly Western. If we could produce an individuality so potent, the derivative procedure might be justified. But with no such savior in sight, we are forced to conclude that our path is not in that direction. We tolerate, instead of saviors, a succession of false prophets as resonant as they are insistent. We listen to them with a deference that is far more expressive of the need within us than of any compulsion in them. So anxious are some of our critics to attain the adult stage implied by the possession of a first-rate composer that, lacking authentic oysters, they give serious attention to what are palpably clams and mussels, in the hope of finding within one the pearl they are convinced is awaiting them.

There is, for example, the case of Roy Harris, who was hailed with the cry of "genius" when he had composed scarcely any music. And now that the second symphony of Harris is produced in New York nearly five years later, one still finds his a musical mentality with but a slight capacity for extended thinking, displayed in a work whose material is of the thinnest, almost pathologically repetitious, possessing no roots in the orchestra, and, additionally, ineptly scored—though it is his fifth work for a large ensemble. Its occasional bursts of vigor are mitigated by a lack of the discipline that experience should have given him. Basically, Harris' problem is more complex than the tangibles of technique and discipline; he must also forget his "mission" if he is ever to write the music that is admittedly within him rather than his present ponderous and self-important pronouncements in tone.

For another example, the well wishers seized upon the George Antheil of a dozen years ago and projected him into an atmosphere (the Paris of that period) that produced what it was fated to produce. What, on reliable authority, was an authentic talent developed into a bundle of conceits, a confused and undirected activity, a musician of sharply limited technique and few resources. Antheil's accomplishments to date have been, essentially, journalistic. He might have produced a sound work in a light vein, but those who disparage such accomplishments have encouraged him toward pretensions that he is not equipped to realize. Now old enough to be producing works at least integrated and solidly characteristic, he is busy emerging from one period into another in an effort to arrive consciously at the expression denied him by the lack of a consistent inner growth. The immaturity that was once his firmest reliance has now become definitely a mannerism; and a mannerism that is no longer even amusing.

However, American music of the day cannot be summed up simply by recalling the injudicious praise of those composers who have not fulfilled the high destiny allotted to them. There are to be

those whose works display a steady control of the materials in hand, a technical skill both polished and substantial, whose newest efforts will at any rate present definite qualities of craftsmanship and mental poise. Preëminent among these are Aaron Copland, Roger Sessions and Walter Piston. Yet it is possible to say that having heard one work of theirs, one has heard them all. The stream of personality is so small and flows in so narrow a channel that there seems little reason to believe that it will deepen or broaden. Their distinctions are almost wholly in the realm of execution. After recovering from the first pleasant shock of hearing an American composition that is well and solidly wrought through its entire length, one realizes that no aspect of the human spirit has been brought nearer one's consciousness . . . that music's essential power, that of communication, has waited vainly to be released.

The basic lack, therefore, is not in the realm of musicianship; it is a want of character, an essential mediocrity of the sheer human stuff that betrays itself when the attention is transferred from the externals of artifice and technique to the core that they surround. Copland, for example, in his "Piano Variations," has accomplished a work of singular directness and structural clarity, yet from it exudes a definite and unmistakable quality of futility. From the early Gallicisms of his "Dance Symphony" through the jazzy piano concerto to his current acerbity, Copland has pursued a various course which finds him reaching now to the palliative of communism to minister to this obvious discontent.

Sessions, an eclectic, seems to pursue a more purposeful path, but the evidence of his orchestral scores (none of which has yet been heard in New York) indicates a man whose works are intrinsically of the study rather than the concert hall. Within that scope they exhibit many facets of interest—a strong rhythmic sense, harmonic keenness and sensibility, a firm hand at orchestration. But the essential ideas are unimpressive; there is a curious want of unity, one mood succeeds another in a way that is neither homogeneous nor, in a valuable sense, contrasting. Sessions has the capacity to be a salient figure in the evolution of a native musical art, but it is likely to be in other roles than that of the composer.

Of the three, Piston has come nearest to the realization of a consistent development in the few works of his that have been performed. There is a real and gratifying professionalism in his solution of the problems that interest him (still a phenomenon to be noted and applauded in our music) and the mark of a thoroughly musical nature is upon each of his works. For more uncommon esthetic qualities one has thus far listened in vain; his cleverly scored orchestral fugue (from the Suite) remains no more than a cleverly scored orchestral fugue. His materials are uniformly honest and workable—their lack of a stronger character is consistent with the blithe

Nor are there, among the younger men, any that show a pure and consistent gift. Jerome Moross has given evidence of a substantial ability, though his real talent for ballet music has not yet been given the opportunity it merits. Russel Bennett, though not a young man, keeps his youthful and alert point of view; but he has let his serious talents be side-tracked in favor of an easy success in the commercial musical world.

Thus, there are in America at the moment any number of composers—but actually no single figure who can confidently be called wholly a composer. To present their works to our musical audience as part of a definite maneuver to earn its respect and consideration is simply to make the task more difficult when an authentic figure does emerge. Could not the energy and finances required to give these works in concert be used for a laboratory or proving ground that would benefit a larger number of aspirants? Certainly the benefits of the reading rehearsals at the Eastman School in Rochester have justified their duplication in every large city in the country. The wave of bequests and endowments that has been used in cultivating the talents of a host of incipient composers since the War has undoubtedly greatly increased their competence. But these shoots and saplings should not be mistaken for full-grown trees.

IRVING KOLODIN.

Washington Notes

Just Another Congress—Two Possibilities of Revolt—Pity the Poor Republicans—Wide-Awake Progressives

AS ONE looks at the Seventy-fourth Congress, now settling down to business after a disturbing week devoted to organization and the reception of the presidential messages, one is compelled to admit that it is not an inspiring spectacle. I do not mean that it is manifestly inferior to the normal Congress, though there are some who rather convincingly argue that such is the fact, but it certainly presents no evidence to either eye or ear of being imbued with any different spirit or having any different ideas or ideals than those of its predecessors. Although it has been hailed as "the first New Deal Congress," it seems to the impartial observer just another Congress. It is the times, not the politicians, that have changed.

Certainly, the leadership, so far as the majority party or administration is concerned, is of the usual drab type. In Mr. Byrns, the new Speaker, there is found the typical Democratic Southern Congressman—a regular of regulars, without initiative, vision, breadth or force, but extremely respectable, likable, experienced, honest and well meaning. Almost the same words may be used to describe the Senate leader, Senator Joseph T. Robinson of Arkansas. If Senator Robinson became Speaker and Speaker Byrns the Senate leader, the situation would not be changed in any essential respect in either body. The same wholehearted acceptance

they are both routine party leaders, who will do their unbrilliant best to put through the administration program and, under White House direction, smother all undesirable legislative efforts.

As for their rank-and-file following, it is so large as to be somewhat unwieldy. Nevertheless, in the main it is eager to follow its leaders in any direction they choose to take, and is likely to offer relatively little trouble. This does not mean that the rank and filers may not override the presidential veto on the bonus question, but if they do, it will be regarded by the leaders as pardonable and in no wise disloyal to the administration. It is also likely that there may be something of a revolt in the rear ranks should the administration take a hostile stand against the Black thirty-hours-a-week bill.

Both bills will be backed by the two most powerful organized minorities in the country—the American Legion and the American Federation of Labor. Congressmen's fear of the effect in their respective states or districts should they oppose either or both of these minorities is likely to swing a great many votes away from the leaders when the time comes. It always has before, and it is an accepted thing that a bolt under such conditions does not constitute punishable recalcitrancy. For one thing, heretofore there have always been too many such bolters to make punishment practicable. Certainly that was true last session, when both House and Senate overrode the President's veto on the issue of restoring federal pay and veterans' compensation. At that time the President lost in the Senate by the small margin of three votes. These, it has always been believed, he could have obtained by personal persuasion had he been present when the vote was taken instead of away fishing on the Astor yacht. Of course the pressure for the bonus and for the complete restoration of federal pay is stronger now than it was then. Also, the new Congress is more committed to the spending-our-way-back-to-prosperity theory than was the previous one.

All in all, the President is expected to yield to Congress on this particular issue, though Congress is likely to follow him the more eagerly on everything else. This, I think it fair to say, is not only the expectation of most observers but of the Democratic congressional leaders as well. It is possible, they say, that should Mr. Roosevelt make a dramatic and determined battle into which he threw every atom of his strength and prestige, he could have his way about the bonus without a compromise. But no one here expects him to make any such fight, and most well posted people have already adjusted themselves to the probability of some form of compromise. A good many think that the pro-bonus element is strong enough to fight off even the compromise. Of one thing we are certain—to wit, that if it becomes necessary to override the President's veto, it will be done by the Democratic rank and file with great reluctance, and their reaction to hundred-percent support of Mr. Roosevelt on everything else will be immediate, violent and complete.

So much for the Democratic membership of the new Congress. On the Republican side, the numerical smallness of that party's representation in both House and Senate and any discussion of it as an important

factor seem futile. Yet it would not be futile if there were exceptional or even capable party leadership there. On the House side, Mr. Bertram Snell of New York is a hard-boiled, stand-pat, old-time Republican of the Longworth school. He is a mediocrity, both personally and politically, with neither the force nor the resourcefulness to be effective. He will make the routine points in a routine way, but his emasculated and enfeebled following in the House will be smothered by the majority on all occasions. Mr. Snell has neither the voice nor the words with which to reach the country, nor is there any individual Republican in his following who has. And this includes the Honorable James W. Wadsworth, who has not improved his party standing or his personal prestige by casting in his lot with an organization quite so obvious as the so-called American Liberty League.

Over on the Senate side, the Republican regulars are in even worse plight. Those who are left are condemned to follow Senator Charlie McNary of Oregon as their leader. Senator McNary is as likely to be on the New Deal side of things as on the other. Senator McNary's watchword and guide in politics is expediency. He will lead—or try to lead—his party in the Senate along lines that he thinks will be popular in Oregon. The result will be that the regular Republicans, having no leader they trust, will vote as they please. Two or three of them will look to National Chairman Henry P. Fletcher for advice, but there will be neither coherency nor clarity in their course. They have neither a man nor a principle to inspire unity: literally nothing in the way of party cement.

The progressive Republicans will be, this time as in the past, the one independent group in the Senate, and from them will come the really forceful opposition to certain administration measures. Also, there will be more unity among them than among the regular Republicans, in spite of the fact that in the group are included the real individualists of the Senate. They will not agree on all points or on all issues, but upon the general directions in which they want to go they are fairly solid—clearer about that, in fact, than Mr. Roosevelt himself.

Washington.

T. R. B.

Lusus Naturae

In jungle sun the air-fed orchids cling
To roots lacing their host, the palm, and breed
Their beauty by the pollen-clotted wing
Of any casual insect; fevered seed
Lifts giant foliage; evil-voiced and shrill
A cry alarms the dark, and hidden apart
Small tender loves dread claw and fang that kill;
Such is the jungle of the passionate heart.

But northerly an arctic region lies
Electric-hued, even as the polar mind
Holds vaster light in its auroral skies
Where the unquiet spirit of mankind
Seems like a migratory bird that goes
At unpredictable times from heat to snows.

Other People's Money

*New Year Baloney—The Banks Do Not Choose
to Lend—Let the Vice-Presidents
Share Their Work*

PROFESSOR Frederic Thomas Blanchard of the University of California recently observed that for pure, unadulterated lying there is nothing like the tombstones in a graveyard. Perhaps the professor has never read the special New Year sections of our daily papers, printed in rose-colored ink and composed by our leading business men and the faithful scribes who are sent out to slice the baloney for them.

This year the baloney came off in exceptionally thick slices. What is of most interest about these "forecasts" to one who has read them all with unflagging interest is that, as you look between the lines, you perceive that they are based on just about the same two premises as the rosy prophecies of 1931, '32, '33 and '34. The first is that this monkey business has gone just about far enough and it is high time for something to break. The other is that "reserves" in banks have risen now to the point where the banks will be driven to lend.

It is interesting to recall that away back in 1931 Mr. Eugene Meyer, then head of the Federal Reserve Board, as the emissary of Mr. Hoover went to the Interstate Commerce Commission and explained to them that loans by the R.F.C. to railroads to pay debts would be a powerful dose of adrenalin to the banks. The R.F.C. would lend the money to the railroads to pay interest and maturities, the roads would pay it, the money would go into the banks and there remain idle. Then presently this money would begin to burn the pockets of the banks and they would itch to lend it. And so the R.F.C. shoveled the money out. But it is now 1935 and these potent pink pills for pale banks have, up to now, failed to develop the itch.

The New York banks have just published their statements. The Irving Trust Company, with \$588,000,000 of capital, surplus and deposits, has loans of \$154,000,000. The Bankers' Trust Company, with deposits, capital and surplus of \$957,000,000, has loans of \$233,104,638. The National City, with deposits, capital, etc., of \$1,552,000,000, has loans of \$482,834,614. The Chase, with \$1,839,000,000, has loans outstanding of \$651,569,766. Of course all these loans are not in commercial credits, but in many instances include Street loans to brokers. One bank with \$58,000,000 in deposits and capital has \$8,000,000 in commercial loans.

Under Hoover the R.F.C. pumped funds into the banks through various channels in obedience to Hoover's "recovery from the top" theory. Roosevelt has continued this policy through his "recovery from the top, bottom and middle" theory. The funds go out, circle around a bit, buy food for the unemployed, get into the grocery stores, the wholesale houses, the factories, stimulate sales of automobiles, clothes, etc., but finally come to complete rest in the banks.

And so up to now the hope that someone, somehow, will

lending soon to somebody, keep faith alive and fill thousands of columns of perfumed, pink bunk in the forecast sections of our daily newspapers.

I have a proposal for a thirty-hour-week law to apply to corporation executives. It is now generally conceded that the N.R.A. was hastily cooked up to defeat the Black-Connery thirty-hour bills in May, 1933. But now, the N.R.A. having turned out to be the most amazing flop in the history of national medicine, the thirty-hour bills come forward again. I suppose they will do no immense harm. But they will, I think, do no great good. Whatever the sponsors hope for them, they will turn out to be nothing more than a means of getting the workers to assume the burdens of unemployment and relief by sharing the work. However, my purpose here is not to discuss the merits of these measures, but rather to make a proposal for amending them—to perform an act of justice in connection with them if they are passed.

These laws will apply at once to the working groups and particularly, through inevitable logic, to the lower-income groups. These people can earn little enough now. This policy will, in effect, make it impossible for them to add to their incomes by working longer hours. Now if this is a good thing for the low-income worker who, as things stand, can barely make enough to support life in decency, why should it not be applied to the higher-income groups? Mr. Brown, let us say, is president of the Interstellar Service Corporation at \$100,000 a year. That certainly is plenty for him. If you read his success story in *Forbes Magazine* or *The Nation's Business*, you learn that the man is a glutton for work—that he is at the office at eight, is the last man to leave the plant and then goes home with a briefcase full of papers over which he pores until midnight. But if you will look him up, you will find that he is also the chairman of the Board of the Rust, Wreck and Ruin Railroad Company at perhaps another \$10,000 a year, the vice-president of the Tubular Equipment Corporation, vice-president of the Puddlers' and Drovers' Bank and director of some forty or fifty other corporations, all of which pay him at least a \$20 Treasury note at every meeting.

Now why not apply this law to Brother Brown? Why not limit him to thirty hours? He will say he cannot get his work done in that time. Very well, hire two or three more vice-presidents and half a dozen more secretaries and take it out of his salary. Also put an end to his holding half a dozen salaried jobs and a score of directorships. Of course, what he means is that he cannot knock off from \$100,000, to \$200,000 a year in a thirty-hour week. But he could make, say, a modest \$50,000 a year and we could take some of these unemployed Park Avenue vice-presidents we hear about off the relief rolls with the rest.

The idea can be carried out all along the line. Those faithful accountants and vice-presidents and cashiers and secretaries and department heads who tell you they never watch the clock—let us make them watch the clock. Force them to knock off at the end of thirty hours. And let their employers hire some additional foremen, assistant superintendents, more vice-presidents and department heads

after all, their pay is so high that they can earn enough money in thirty hours to live, while the men to whom we now propose to apply this thirty-hour rule can't earn enough to live in that time. Of course, better still would be a plan to share the income rather than share the work. But that is out of the question under our pleasant revolution. Mr. Roosevelt has assured business and business men and profit makers that their earnings and profits will not be disturbed by further taxation. And so we are to make a further "move toward the left." We are to set in motion a "share-the-work" plan to impose the burdens of our disaster on the people in the very lowest income brackets.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

On the Labor Front

*Before and After the Cotton Garment Code—
Tempting Employers—The Musicians
End a Dictatorship*

IF THE N.R.A. and Congress are interested in discovering ways and means of making the labor provisions of the codes more effective, they could do no better than peruse a study recently completed by the Pennsylvania Bureau of Women and Children. It is a careful analysis comparing women's earnings in the cotton-garment industry before and after the Cotton Garment Code was approved. On the favorable side, the report points to two desirable results that the code has had: it has reduced working hours and increased weekly earnings. In a study made by the Bureau in October, 1932, it was found that the usual work week was fifty hours or more. In the spring of 1934 (after the code had been in effect several months) it was found that only three percent of the workers were reported as working longer than the forty hours fixed in the code, while 70 percent were actually working less than forty hours. Between the same two periods the median of women's weekly earnings increased from \$7.54 (half earning more, half less) to \$10.95.

But these favorable results are offset by evidence that clearly reveals the present shortcomings of code administration. First, of course, is the fact that \$10.95 falls considerably short of the minimum of \$13 fixed in the code. The majority of women workers did not receive this minimum (15 percent actually got less than \$5 a week) because of part-time work and also because of code exceptions and violations. The Bureau found that there was an "unprecedented temptation" among employers to falsify hour records, "since through the manipulation of such records it is possible to make compliance appear where violations actually exist." In some cases the employers themselves prepared these misleading reports but, "more often the firms transferred to the employees the onus of recording hours of work, with the understanding that workers who could not show that they earned the minimum wage (32½ cents per hour) were to be fired." In thirteen of the one hundred and fourteen firms included in the study the reports were of such "dubious accuracy" that they could not be used.

It is not surprising to learn also that there were widespread violations in the employment of learners and of

ers it was possible to interview, two out of three were not really learners. One worker with twelve years' experience was classified as a learner. The Bureau also concluded that not more than half of the workers classed as handicapped by employers were genuinely handicapped. Employers are sorely tempted, of course, to have as many "learners" and "handicapped" on the payroll as possible, since the code permits workers so classified to be paid less than the minimum wage. At present there is neither adequate enforcement on the part of the N.R.A. nor sufficient organization of the workers to prevent such subterfuge.

The evidence in this report should make two things quite clear: (1) we shall never know precisely what effect the codes are having until Congress makes it mandatory for employers to furnish full and accurate data on hours and wages; and (2) we cannot expect labor provisions in codes to be really meaningful until labor itself is in a strong position, through its own organization, to police such provisions and to force employers to observe them. It is on these considerations that Congress should center its attention if it wants to make the N.R.A. more fruitful from the labor point of view.

One of the most encouraging signs of late is the growing strength of rank-and-file movements within the American Federation of Labor. Even more encouraging is the fact that the attempts of A.F. of L. leaders to head off this upsurge by labeling it "Communist" have met with little sympathy from the workers. In New York City, the American Federation of Musicians, Local 802, has just brought to an end a dictatorship of many years by electing a complete opposition ticket. The only official to escape defeat was Edward Canavan, the president, who holds his position through appointment. By order of the international president of the Musicians' union, the local was not permitted to vote on Mr. Canavan's recall.

The success of the opposition ticket represents a genuine victory for democratic unionism. In a referendum last spring, the membership of the New York local voted 3,127 to 128 in favor of local autonomy, but when a committee of fifteen was appointed to revise the by-laws, the members of the committee were fined and expelled from the union. In addition they were accused of having Communist affiliations. But the Red scare was not successful. The committee members won a reversal of their expulsion through a Supreme Court injunction, and the recent election makes their vindication complete: most of the newly elected officers are former members of the committee. As a result of this victory, the members of the local will probably be able to get an itemized accounting of dues collected—the first in thirteen years.

The N.R.A. employees' union has also recently won a significant victory. Following the annual convention of the American Federation of Government Employees last fall, the N.R.A. local issued a minority report, criticizing the undemocratic procedure at the convention. The report condemned the action of the convention in forbidding mass picketing and the use of protest delegations, as well as the refusal of the convention to take any action against Negro segregation and discrimination in government service. It was charged that the dictatorial procedure of E. Claude Babcock national president . . .

full expression of opinion on these matters. For this report, the N.R.A. union was accused of "disloyalty to the American labor movement" and threatened with suspension of its charter. The N.R.A. union refused, however, to retract any of the charges made in its minority report. Instead, it brought pressure on the A.F.G.E. officials through newspaper publicity and by appeals to the membership of all locals. To President Babcock's surprise, these efforts brought forth a substantial sentiment favorable to the N.R.A. union among the rank and file of other A.F.G.E. locals. Seeing this, Babcock hastily changed his mind and withdrew his charges against the union.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

A COMMUNICATION

Marxists and Liberals in Retrospect

SIR: Liberals are persons who are always being fooled. This often repeated remark, while it in no way defines that elusive term applied to a great body of radical well wishers, gives us their outstanding characteristic. These people are emotionally sympathetic to the cause of radical change, both political and economic. They are intelligent enough to see through many of the shams of our society and their moral rejection of the rottenness that pervades it is a sign that their senses are alive and a tribute to their idealism, which makes them seek a way out. The weakness of the liberals' position lies in a lack of understanding of the capitalistic society they wish to change. That is why the liberal finds after a period of social crisis that he has fought on the side of the enemy. He then suffers the humiliation of having been duped. For it is in the most critical periods, when the course of events runs swiftly, that the underlying weakness of the liberals manifests itself.

The early months of the Roosevelt administration were such a critical period. Things were happening. The activities of the government made big news almost daily. The whole picture was so different from the dull inactivity of former administrations that the result was dazzling—which, of course, was what it was meant to be. The government itself professed to feel a dependence upon public opinion which it used all the regular methods to arouse. Campaigns, oratory, a sympathetic press, radio, movies, all kinds of ballyhoo were utilized, to what purpose? That was precisely the point upon which liberals and radicals disagreed.

The Marxists looked upon the change as just what it was—simply a shift upon the part of the government from a policy of passivity to one of activity. They remembered and continued to remind others that this was still the government of a capitalist nation. In peace and war they believed that such a government could be counted on to play its role as the agency of the powerful capitalist class. This had been the experience of the past. Let future experience modify such an understanding of the role of government, if it was to be modified.

The liberals, with no well defined social philosophy to guide them, were caught in the whirl of events. They refused to accept what they termed generalizations and dogmas concerning the . . .

before passing judgment. And while they waited and watched and held their judgment in suspense, they of course could not act, for how could they act unless they knew which side to take. But it is at critical times that action must be taken, if at all, for after crises are over it is too late. The passive onlooker has drifted with the current.

Before the National Industrial Recovery Act was yet law, *The Communist*, the theoretical organ of the Communist Party of America, commented boldly as follows:

It will mean the driving out of the smaller capitalists and the further concentration and centralization in fewer hands. It aims to set up a planned economy. This, of course, will meet with defeat. Even government spokesmen admit that it will not abolish competition but "raise it to a higher level." This is exactly what is taking place in the course of the development of imperialism and leads not only to competition "on a higher plane," at home, but internationally, culminating in imperialist war. This phase of the bill is not a curbing of the big trusts, as the liberals would have us believe, nor control by the government of finance capital. On the contrary, it means greater control of the government by finance capital, by the very big capitalists, through squeezing out of the smaller ones.

Editorially, *The New Republic's* comment was characterized by indefiniteness typified by such extracts as these:

It is easy to summarize the words of the Industrial Recovery Bill, more difficult to predict what it will be like in practice.

Clearly, here is a bill which gives private industry a chance to see what it can do to improve the economic system with the aid of the research and police power of the government and of potential collective bargaining for labor.

It establishes the minimum essentials with which it may be safe to concede to industry exemption from anti-trust laws.

The result may be merely a series of cartels and price-valorization schemes. . . . Or, conceivably, it may mark the beginning not merely of recovery but of collectivization of the economic system. (May 21, 1933.)

The *New Republic*, as is usual with liberals, was giving most of its attention to the wording of the law, the personalities of its sponsors, and declarations of intent on the part of Roosevelt and other government officials, and hence was baffled in trying to discern the probable future course of events. If, instead, the editors had analyzed the economic situation, had placed the emphasis of interpretation upon the crisis confronting capitalism, and the failure of a passive capitalistic government to solve its problems, then they would have seen Roosevelt clearly in his historic role of a new leader of the capitalists trying to save the system by more active methods. Then they would have realized that, despite all sorts of declarations to the contrary, the workers were being considered only so much as was necessary to maintain a system that depends for its existence upon profits. They would have realized that the idea of increasing purchasing power by raising the return to labor was, in so far as it received consideration at all, only for the purpose of priming the pump for profits. Even if this

"on our way." The relation of the N.R.A., with its elimination of the anti-trust laws, to the advantage of the great capitalists, to the growing stress on economic nationalism as revealed by America's policy in the London economic conference, and the impetus to war preparations given by the Roosevelt administration, should have revealed something of the real course the "New Deal recovery" was taking.

As for the famous 7a clause of the Recovery Act, well grounded radicals never expected that it would mean anything but what it turned out to be—bait to enlist support of organized labor and liberal public opinion in the cause of the Roosevelt program. Did liberals forget that pro-labor laws that were never enforced still remained on the statute books of almost every state? Did they put so much faith in the words of the law that they failed to remember the contradictions in the Constitution itself which the courts interpreted for the benefit of the ruling class? We quote from an editorial of August 30, 1933, to show to just what extent the liberals forgot the lessons of experience:

It is certainly an important piece of progress that the Roosevelt government should now be standing wholeheartedly behind a policy of independent and aggressive trade unionism. . . .

But the battle is not ended: indeed, it is only beginning. Everything now depends upon how the Act is administered. . . .

. . . The government will have to step in and protect the union members in the exercise of their legal rights. If this is not done, the government will have broken its word and conspired to violate the terms of its own law.

Did the editor who wrote this really think it was conceivable that government would in the future send soldiers and police to coerce capitalists in their struggles with labor?

The overemphasis on the factor of individual personalities pervades liberal political opinion. Such quotations as are given here from *The New Republic* are illustrative.

He [Roosevelt] has great powers compared with any single individual under the old system of divided authority; he also has great responsibility and if there is a failure the blame falls squarely on him. . . . Everything now depends upon the way in which he uses his powers. He can, if he decides to, take the United States a considerable distance on the road toward state capitalism if not state socialism. . . . (June 28, 1933.)

The New Deal, as explained by Mr. Roosevelt, is one in which the government, the mass of industry, labor and the consuming public are admitted to partnership. It is up to the President to see that this is done. (August 9, 1933.)

Compare these statements with what one finds in the pages of *The Communist* in the issue of August, 1933.

In the history of the development of American imperialism, it has always been the ironic role of the political Don Quixotes in the camp of the bourgeoisie, who rise into power on a wave of mass discontent against the "trusts" and "big capital," to advance schemes for the reformation of these trusts that in practice work to the best interests of finance capital. . . .

that the President *was* fighting capitalism (quite the contrary) but that it would be necessary for him to do so if he wanted to achieve his declared aims. Anybody who read the article could draw no other conclusion from it.

The Communists, on the other hand, adopted the line of declaring in advance that Roosevelt was not trying to do anything for the masses, and that everything he did, without exception, was wrong. This line had the primary disadvantage of being, in the eyes of most citizens, obviously untrue. It looked like twisting the facts to make them fit a dogma. In addition, it prevented the Communists from deriving any educational value out of the experiments in reform. Communists scoff at education and demand "action," but no action is more necessary than to help the people to see what they must do to get what they want. People who eventually become disillusioned may, it is true, turn to the Communists because of their simple stand of complete opposition, but such a blanket opposition, without any detailed understanding of why the President fails, is just as likely to turn the masses over to an Ogden Mills or a Huey Long.—THE EDITORS.]

CORRESPONDENCE

Victory for a United Front

SIR: Harold Robins and Andre Gras, railroaded to prison for their militant activity in the New York City hotel strike last December, were granted a new trial by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court on Friday, December 7.

The reversal of their conviction came after Robins and Gras had served eight months of their sentences. The decision, unanimously voted by the five justices, criticized the trial judge, Joseph E. Corrigan, for "sarcastic characterization of the defendants," the suspicions he cast on the defendants' alibis, his failure to discuss discrepancies in the testimony of hostile witnesses, and the "plain import" of Corrigan's attempt "to indicate to the jury the court's opinion that Robins had been employed as a strong-arm man by the union."

After their conviction last April, Robins and Gras appealed to the Provisional Committee for Non-Partisan Labor Defense to initiate a struggle for their release. The Non-Partisan Labor Defense called for the organization of a broad representative Robins-Gras Defense Committee. Among those who answered the call were the Workers' Party of the United States, the Socialist Party and the Communist Party Opposition. Among the unions that supported the defense were the Dressmakers' Joint Board and the Cloakmakers' Joint Board of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, the New York Joint Board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the United Hebrew Trades and many of its affiliates, and the Amalgamated Food Workers' Union. More than a hundred branches of the Workmen's Circle also contributed funds.

The secretary of the Robins-Gras Defense Committee declared "Such temporary united fronts as the Robins-Gras Defense Committee are a valuable working-class instrument for defense. What is urgently needed, however, is a permanent, autonomous labor-defense organization of membership branches to which workers of all political tendencies will belong."

New York City.

FELIX MORROW.

Munitions Go Nationalist

SIR: Your editorial ["The du Ponts Testify," *The New Republic*, December 19] on the revelations of the Senate Committee's munitions investigation points out quite clearly the difficulty of controlling the powerful munitions group, and I believe that you

But I do not agree with you that government monopoly of munitions manufacture would, in itself, be a step towards peace, even "an almost microscopic step." Certainly, whether it would or not would depend upon the policy of the government, and, governments being what they are just now, it would be absurd to suppose that any government would direct its control over munitions manufacture in the interests of peace. . . .

It seems to me that you have permitted your natural animosity toward the private ownership of the means of production to cloud the situation under consideration. If the world were one federation of soviet republics and if each of these republics carefully drew a distinction between "welfare" and "power," in Strachey's terminology, then *presumably* there would be no cause and no desire for the manufacture of munitions, beyond the requirements of police forces. But Marxian theory itself is most emphatic on the inevitability of national and imperialistic conflict in the absence of such a federation. . . .

Ironically enough, however, munitions manufacture, as is well known, has been carried on in the spirit of international coöperation of those engaged in directing this work in the face of a growing economic nationalism by which, paradoxically, these coöperative and internationally minded men have stood to profit—up to a point. For the question that was bound to arise sooner or later now comes up: who are to be masters and who servants, the munitions manufacturers or the governments within whose borders they operate? You seem to think this question has already been raised and answered in favor of the munitions manufacturers whom the governments were not willing to challenge. But it seems to me that it was not fear on the part of the governments but coöperation with their respective munitions interests that forestalled any governmental challenge. . . . Nor do I think that this policy has lapsed; it has merely entered a new phase coincident with the growing economic nationalism. . . .

San Francisco, Calif.

C. J. SULLIVAN, JR.

How to Raise More Revenue

SIR: Big business, strongly organized, continues to demand that the budget be balanced beginning July 1, 1936; that low wages be maintained by restricting dole payments; that a fixed gold dollar be reestablished; that the Securities Act be amended so that entrenched wealth can again dominate; that government costs be substantially reduced.

Such demands should force our next Congress either to raise more revenue by eliminating the tax-exempt feature of all bonds or reduce fixed charges by retiring most of our interest-bearing public debt with government money. Now that we are off the gold standard, there can be no difference between government bonds and government money, except the precious tax-exempt interest coupons. Idle dollars, forced to work, will create jobs and revive the durable-goods industry.

With our \$10,000,000,000 of revalued gold and silver used as a monetary base, we can issue \$25,000,000,000 of money, and still retain the 40-percent ratio considered by most gold economists necessary for "sound" money. The twenty billion additional dollars would retire the bulk of our outstanding bonds, and besides saving nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars' yearly interest, would replace half the pen-and-ink money our bankers have withdrawn from circulation because of their determination to restrict credit.

Money, being only a medium of exchange, is not wealth, but is in reality evidence of debt. There should be provided by Congress sufficient money to move all the products of this machine age from the producers to the consumers, who through their ability and desire to consume goods, represent the virtual wealth of the nation.

This solution will not appeal to economists whose ideas are the result of the subsidized system of the money lenders. These men may still cling to their fallacious theories, but our citizens are rapidly learning the real cause of their poverty, and how they can effect the remedy. Adequate monetary readjustments are inevitable. Delay is dangerous. The Seventy-fourth Congress should assume its responsibility now.

BOOKS IN REVIEW

The Smart Set Legend

THE REAL Smart Set was a much less inspiring and imposing magazine than Burton Rascoe implies in his lively introduction to "The Smart Set Anthology."¹ He pictures it as bursting like a bombshell in a Methodist graveyard, as frightening and coaxing American literature out of the tomb where the Comstocks had buried it, as continually discovering new talents and as printing nearly everybody worth printing in the ten years before 1923. That is the Smart Set legend and there is a kernel of truth in it, but the truth is surrounded with a shell of sentiment and a thick husk of exaggeration. Indeed, my chief surprise on reading the present collection, with its 850 pages of stories, poems, plays and horseplays, was at finding how many good American writers had never appeared in The Smart Set, or mailed even an angry letter to the editors.

Anderson, Dos Passos, Brooks, Hemingway, Sandburg—there is no use mentioning names when figures are available. Last summer Carl Van Doren published his anthology of "Modern American Prose," which included extracts from the work of what he regarded as the sixty best prose writers since 1915. Van Doren has always praised the former editors of The Smart Set and has concurred in most of their judgments. Yet of the sixty writers he selected—of fifty-eight, to be utterly fair, since two of them began publishing after 1923—only twenty-one ever appeared in The Smart Set, and most of these were represented by neither their earliest nor their mature work. The situation among the poets is even more striking. Mark Van Doren edited an anthology that contains, in its final pages, the work of thirty poets born since 1875. Only four of these ever had poems printed in The Smart Set. There is no confirmation here for the legend that Mencken and Nathan were foster parents to the younger American literature.

Yet the Smart Set legend has a basis in fact and in time. There happens to have been a brief period when no other American magazine was so interesting or influential, and Rascoe tells the whole story in his introduction. Early in 1913, the owner of the magazine was buffaloeed into signing a year's contract with a young editor named Willard Huntington Wright. The contract specified that Wright was to have an absolutely free hand in selecting manuscripts and a generous budget with which to pay for them. He had the intoxicating sense of being able to do just what he pleased, and what he pleased was to print the recent European writers—Schnitzler, Joyce, Lawrence, Max Beerbohm, Wedekind, Artzibashev, d'Annunzio. Not one of these men had ever before been published in an American magazine; the public scarcely knew that they existed. When they were gathered together and printed in twelve successive issues, each more brilliant than the last, their impact on younger readers was tremendous; I can offer this testimony out of my own experience. It seemed that a new world was being revealed to us, that it was time to smash the Victorian gods, open all the windows, go floating off on a cloud of dream toward golden Vienna and Paris the City of Light.

Rascoe is probably right in saying that The Smart Set for 1913 was "the most audacious, the best edited and the best remembered of any magazine ever published on this

continent." Unfortunately it was not the most profitable. The publisher was disturbed by the attacks of ministers and editorial writers; he was not reassured by looking at his ledgers. He waited for the contract to expire, showed Wright the door, and then, in the issue of March, 1914, he announced a change of policy in a document that is worth quoting at length. After explaining that "to gather laurels is one thing; to publish a successful magazine is another," he described some of the laurels gathered during Wright's editorship. "But," he continued,

... together with this academic approval we have received stout protests. Many of our most valued readers have written us that they did not like the innovation; some of the stories, though written by distinguished English, Continental and American authors, have struck them as too somber; the frankness of certain others has displeased them. In short, we have been too serious as regards the relation of literature to life.

We admit a certain force in the criticism, and so, while modestly wearing the bays we have gathered during the past year, we announce, not a less discriminating realism in such realistic stories as we may publish, but a good round measure of romantic and humorous relief, to the end that our friends, old and new, may find in us that variety they ask of a magazine which, above all, seeks to entertain. We shall continue to make our appeal especially to the well educated, thinking, appreciative alert-minded class of Americans who like fiction with a little tang to it; who relish a bit of subtlety now and then; who like to be surprised; who enjoy stories of ideas; stories with a strong dramatic flavor; stories containing an occasional thrill; in a nutshell, stories different from those found in the usual magazine.

There are thousands upon thousands of such readers in this country—readers to whom the word "smart" in its best sense of acuteness, nimble-mindedness, up-to-dateness, makes a strong appeal—yet who are not ultra in any respect. These are the readers we want, even though they may not be ahead of modern literary currents. We shall be satisfied if they are merely abreast—with us.

I think this document should be studied in every school of journalism: it offers the best possible program for painlessly suffocating a magazine. When editors begin to talk about being romantic without ceasing to be realistic—about being subtle and a little sexy while remaining innately wholesome—about pleasing the radicals and the conservatives simultaneously—then it is time to call for oxygen tanks and blood transfusions; the patient is about to expire. The only marvel is that The Smart Set lived on for ten years.

Partly it lived because the legend refused to die; but chiefly it lived because of Mencken and Nathan, who became joint editors a few months after Wright's contract expired. They were not much interested, I suspect, in his program of publishing the most brilliant work of the best European writers. Nathan wanted to say what he thought about the new plays; Mencken wanted to write literary criticisms and pursue his long crusade against rural Baptists. As long as they were given their own pages to fill as they pleased, as long as they could print a few stories they really admired, they were willing to edit the rest of the magazine for people who like fiction with a little tang to it and relish

¹ The Smart Set Anthology, edited by Burton Rascoe and Groff Conklin. New York: Reynal and Hyatt, 1934.

Mr. Wilder in the Middle West

Heaven's My Destination, by Thornton Wilder. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$2.50.

SEVERAL years ago, Thornton Wilder was the center of a controversy on Marxism and literature. He was challenged by Michael Gold and others to come away from his first-century Greek islands and his imaginary eighteenth-century Perus and turn his attention to the United States. Mr. Wilder has here taken up the challenge; and though, in the course of the polemical battle, he was sometimes unfairly treated, the polemics have been justified if they inspired, as they are said to have done, this new book.

"Heaven's My Destination" seems to me much Mr. Wilder's best novel. It is as brilliant and sharp as "The Woman of Andros," which seems to me his weakest novel, was comparatively mawkish and pale. In fact, the effect on Mr. Wilder of taking his opponents' advice—if that is what happened—has been so vividly to bring him to life that they are likely to experience a shock. In the first place, he has applied to the smoking-cars, the summer camps and the boarding-houses of the Middle West the gift of social observation which he exercised in "The Cabala" on an aristocratic international society, but which in his intervening books has been left more or less unemployed; and Oklahoma City, Kansas City and Ozarkville become much more entertaining places than even his Roman drawing-rooms. Besides this, he has created in his central character, George Brush, the religious textbook salesman, a more complete and living person than in any of his other books. Furthermore, the pathetic Proustian cadences have vanished from Mr. Wilder's style; his sentimentality is nowhere in evidence. The tone is always comic or matter of fact—with the result that Mr. Wilder's vision of an imperfect and suffering humanity comes through a great deal more tellingly than in his earlier books. And—what makes "Heaven's My Destination" unique in its Middle Western field—he has handled his Sinclair Lewis material with his characteristic elegance of form and felicity of detail, his peculiar characteristic Mozartian combination of lightness and grace with seriousness. (The Keats and Mozart affinities of Mr. Wilder were what his opponents in the Gold-Wilder controversy tended to leave out of consideration; but he is probably the only contemporary American whom it is possible to mention in connection with such names—the only one, I mean, who is really good and who has anything in common with them.)

Mr. Wilder's hero, George Brush, though professionally a textbook salesman, is by vocation a saint. "Of all the forms of genius," Mr. Wilder quotes on the title-page from "The Woman of Andros," "goodness has the longest awkward age." When we first encounter George Brush, he is attempting to save souls in the smoking-car and annoying hotel managers by writing Bible texts on the blotters. He comes from a farm in Michigan, he has graduated from Shiloh Baptist College, and he has been converted by a child evangelist, full of morphine. But he has thought out his own principles of righteousness and he appears as many kinds of a crank. He feels that he can never become a minister because he once fornicated with a farmer's daughter at a farm where he was spending the night. He has been looking for her ever since to marry her. He is always getting arrested as a result of his unconventional behavior in his attempts to live up to his principles. He insists upon

to give the bank the interest because he believes in "voluntary poverty"; and unnecessarily presents a hold-up man with some money in order to "show him that he's really a beggar at heart." In the course of his twenty-fourth year, the period covered by the story, he makes himself absurd and obnoxious in an extraordinary variety of ways. He encounters in his traveling-salesman's adventures many types of human beings: the conscientious and desperate man, the cynical and desperate man (the story takes place during the depression), the intelligent man caught in a routine, the brilliant man made harsh by intellectual pride, the professional prostitute and the professional minister of the Gospel, the criminal and the police. They reason with George Brush, remonstrate with him, play jokes on him, insult him, rob him, beat him up, jail him; but in a sense they are all powerless against him, because he is a genuinely virtuous man sustained by the conviction of the correctness of his intentions. And although his program for edifying people is almost completely wrong, he manages to do them good in ways which he has never contemplated simply by being what he is: a man who takes his obligations to the rest of humanity so seriously that questions of his own interest do not exist for him.

At last he succeeds in finding the girl he has slept with one night and whom he feels he is bound by duty to marry. She is more or less unattractive and doesn't in the least want to marry him. But he finally induces her to do so and she is extremely unhappy with him. He has to go out on the road again, and she lets him know that she wants to leave him. (This is the only part of the story which seems to me incomplete and a little unconvincing. Why was Roberta, when George Brush turned up again, so bitterly opposed to having anything to do with him? Why, when they were married, did he not proceed with his program of producing the six children which he considered essential to an American home?)

He loses his faith on the road and falls ill. He is crushed by the idea that his life has been a failure, that everything he has done has been stupid and that everybody has come to hate him.

But now a strangely important incident occurs. There has been in Kansas City a Polish priest named Father Pasziewski. We have heard almost nothing about him except that he has been at death's door with gallstones, that he has then recovered and gone on with his work, that he is "an awful disappointed man" because the boys and girls of his parish to whom he has devoted himself as "the Knights of St. Ludowick" and "Mary's Flowers" have turned into dance-hall girls and gangsters. He and George Brush have never met, but each has always inquired about the other: each has recognized the other's vocation. George Brush has been deeply moved by the news that Father Pasziewski was praying for him on Fridays. Now Father Pasziewski has died, and he has given his silver spoons away to his friends, and he has sent George Brush one. George recovers and goes on getting into trouble.

Mr. Wilder has told this story with great skill and made it on the surface extremely funny. A scarcely suspected gift of humor is another resource of Mr. Wilder's that has suddenly emerged in this book. But his real theme is George Brush's development, his education in the course of his adventures. And the remarkable feat he performs is to make us end by respecting and liking him.

I do not see any reason why the radical reviewers who have been urging Thornton Wilder to write about his native land should find "Heaven's My Destination" in-

George Brush up with the Church. But the act of divine intervention—I suppose that Mr. Wilder intends it as such—the arrival of the silver spoon, is not in itself, like the well timed collapse of the Bridge of San Luis Rey, implausible to the non-believer. And in the meantime Mr. Wilder has given us something more even than an excellent picture of an American variety of religious experience. George Brush is, as I have said, the type of saint, and he is therefore a universal character. The saint is a very special kind of person, but he turns up in other fields besides the religious one. The radical movement, too, has its saints, and they are people fundamentally akin to George Brush. Upton Sinclair in his early phases resembled him in some ways quite closely and committed some of the same kind of absurdities.

The radical's real objection to "Heaven's My Destination" is that Mr. Wilder never allows Brush to encounter a radical. What about the next generation of Father Pasziewskis? I happen to know the child of a family of Polish priests who, taking with him the best features of the family tradition, has become an energetic Communist. And what about George Brush in ten years? We leave him at twenty-four: what is to be the rest of his education? He has apparently already discarded the Fundamentalism which he affirmed at twenty-three. We are apparently intended to understand that he has finally investigated Darwin and no longer accepts the Garden of Eden. But what is to prevent him from going further along these lines? What is to prevent him, with his terrible logic, from turning into a Roger Baldwin? What is to prevent him, with his pacifist principles, from discovering, as did A. J. Muste, that other religious pacifist, with whom, also, George Brush has something in common, that the causes of war are involved with the social-economic system—and turning into a labor organizer?

From the tenor of Mr. Wilder's other work, I assume that when George Brush gets well and goes on trying to live up to his principles, he has recovered his faith in God. But this is actually left rather ambiguous, and perhaps Mr. Wilder ought to be challenged again to make it clear just what George Brush's beliefs are when he goes out on the road again.

EDMUND WILSON.

Poet of New England

Rock and Shell, by John Brooks Wheelwright. Boston: Bruce Humphries. 87 pages. \$2.50.

IT IS difficult to regard John Wheelwright's book of poems as a separate item in a list of contemporary poetry. This is not to say that the book lacks its own unity or lacks the impress of an original personality. Wheelwright is one of the few matured poets of our time and each of the twenty-one poems represented here is made distinctive through the choice of an exact and personal vocabulary. What I mean to say is that any adequate appraisal of his book involves a discussion of New England's literature and those peculiarities that define the character of the New England mind.

At first reading Wheelwright's poetry seems far more complex or willfully obscure than it really is. Outwardly it bears a close relationship to the work of those Americans who felt most strongly the influence of the French from Rimbaud to Cocteau. This relationship, however, is of the most superficial order. Again, there is a suggestion of Thomas Lovell Beddoes in the clarity of the images, in the

medium, and in the preoccupation with death, heresy, martyrdom. But the poetry of "Rock and Shell" is, in reality, an epilogue to the tradition of New England culture; one has only to remember Jonathan Edwards and to read passages from Emerson, Thoreau, Oliver Wendell Holmes, to find the emotional sources of the book. At this moment when everyone is talking about "regional" literature, I suggest John Wheelwright's poetry as one of few books in that field which merits serious discussion, for "Rock and Shell" is both a genuine document and the work of a poet who, even in his failures, deserves a fair measure of critical admiration.

The most successful poems in this selection are "Come Over and Help Us," "Gestures to the Dead," "To Wise Men on the Death of a Fool"; a possible fourth poem would be "Forty Days." The first four lines of "Come Over and Help Us" convey the heart of Wheelwright's argument and reveal something of an inflexible technique that on occasion disintegrates a poem into a series of linear commentaries, yet seldom fails in giving us a necessary element that is contained in all poetry worthy of the name: I mean intensity:

Our masks are gauze and screen our faces for those unlike us only,
Who are easily deceived. Pierce through these masks to our unhidden tongues
And watch us scold, scold with intellectual lust; scold
Ourselves, our foes, our friends; Europe, America, Boston; and all that is not
Boston; till we reach a purity, fierce as the love of God.

HORACE GREGORY.

Detour to the Dead Sea

Fascism and Social Revolution, by R. Palme Dutt. New York: International Publishers. 307 pages. \$2.25.

SUPERFICIAL observers still define fascism as the coming to power of the neglected middle classes, who thus disrupt the continuity of capitalist evolution. In reality, fascism can be understood only as the outcome of tendencies present in all modern capitalism, and this Palme Dutt clearly demonstrates in the first four chapters of his book. Capitalism has now reached a stage where, in order to maintain itself, it must fight against the advance of productive forces: the system has entered a period of decay. But capitalist decay is not a peaceful process. Under the pressure of explosive forces, stricken by the presage of imminent breakdown, capitalism throws off all that is nonessential to its existence, denies the ideals of its youth, does away with institutions and justifications that hitherto have concealed its true nature, and appears as a brutal dictatorship. This and nothing else defines the essence of fascism. The moment it is born, it proceeds to the violent suppression of workers' organizations striving for the other alternative: the revolutionary transformation of society, the creation of an order that will permit a new advance of productive forces.

That no third way out is possible, that even the attempt to follow a middle course inevitably plays into the hands of the ruling classes, is shown by the history of fascism in Europe and the role of reformism in this development (Chapters 5 to 8 of the book). The Social Democrats wanted to reconcile class antagonisms, to save capitalists and workers alike, to increase simultaneously wages and

vague philanthropic emotion, which led them to adopt the famous policy of "the lesser evil." Setting aside Marxist analysis for the sake of "generous" feelings was only the prelude to refuting Marxism by the burning of books and the massacre of revolutionists.

Marxism has never been refuted by any other method. Fascist theories, to which the two subsequent chapters of the book are devoted, are essentially a mask for fascist violence. The intellectual merits of these theories cannot be underestimated. Here, too, Palme Dutt could have pointed out a certain continuity between bourgeois democracy and fascism. Already, under the former, economic and political doctrines are to a great extent illusions and rationalizations. Under fascism the rift between theory and practice is complete; what has been mere difference has become outright contradiction. The verbal meaning of the essential fascist themes is in direct opposition to the facts they are supposed to express. The reality of the "totalitarian state" is the absolute power of a capitalist minority; "emergence of the youth" translates its enslavement in labor camps; "economic self-sufficiency" is only the intense preparation for the seizure of foreign markets; fascist "nationalism" means the sell-out of the nation to the private interests of monopolies; and of course, the real meaning of fascist "revolution" is counter-revolution. If, considered as a whole, fascism is the "organization of social decay," culturally it is the organization of social lies on a gigantic scale.

Palme Dutt never uses grandiloquent phrases, the metaphysical jugglery with which a Spengler creates his "tragic atmosphere." Yet nowhere else could one find a more truly dramatic vision of the modern world, of its colossal forces gradually girding for the final battle, than in this concise array of facts and documents logically presented. Here again, the Marxist method of historical analysis reveals itself as the path to lucid action.

NORBERT GUTERMAN.

The Epic of Peru

Fire on the Andes, by Carleton Beals. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company. 482 pages. \$3.

BEALS has tried to set down the whole truth about a people, the people of Peru, and has largely succeeded. He has written what amounts to an epic poem, complete with statistics. At the end of his book, the Peruvian nation becomes as simple and familiar, and at the same time as profoundly contradictory and mysterious, as a neighbor living down the street.

I suppose no book with as much truth in it—what seems to be the truth—will ever be written about the United States. Our institutions are too vast, the actions of one person upon another too subterranean and too overlaid with hypocrisy, for any one author to know them without, before he is done, himself becoming tainted. In Peru, Beals could stand apart from his subject matter, and write what he saw. But since men are everywhere much the same, and have much the same difficulties in living together, probably what he tells about Peru is, at bottom, the truth about the United States. Beals's long sketch of the Lima politician, the Marques de Rivevalle, for example, is with only the most trivial changes the story of a very well known United States leader. Only no one will ever write about the United States leader with the candor and understanding which Beals writes of his counterpart. For one

gamonalistas of the Cordillera valleys with their Indian serfs, and the relationship of our Southern landowners with their Negro share-croppers. Yet no writer will ever describe peonage in the South with the same first-hand knowledge and scientific unconcern with which Beals describes it in Peru. A mastodon, like the United States, won't go under a microscope.

Beals tells, with great charm and poetry, the story of Peru from Manco Capac, the first Inca, and his sister-wife, Coya Mama Ocllo, down through the still incredible encounter of Atahualpa and Pizarro, down through the revolutions of Bolivar and San Martin (who leave Beals cold), to the dreary, absurd dictators of today. Then he methodically pulls his subject, Peru, to pieces and builds it up again. He runs up and down the country collecting people who, for one reason or another, impress him as important, a half-dozen small-time aristocrats, a bishop, a rural priest, three sorcerers, a rubber-gatherer from the Amazon, a handful of women. These are the elemental units that all generalizations must fit, for these people, and their interactions upon each other, are Peru. Incidentally one of Beals's sketches, "Punishing of San Lorenzo," which tells how Indians stole a Christian saint from its shrine and singed its wooden feet to force it to bring rain, makes a superb short story. Then Beals describes his people by townfuls, the people of Lima, Trujillo, Huancayo, Huanuco, Ayacucho, Arequipa, Cuzco and Iquitos. Finally he collects them into the basic groups of the nation, the landowners, the clergy, the army officers, the agents of foreign corporations, the students, the revolutionists, the artists.

Beals found no one in Peru, like Zapata in Mexico or Sandino in Nicaragua, to whom he wished to give his personal allegiance. It seems to me his book gains depth from this. The ambiguous figure of Victor Raul Haya de la Torre, head of A.P.R.A. and now admittedly leader of all Latin America, a man in many ways comically like Roosevelt, forces him into exhaustive political analysis. Beals thinks that Haya is likely to go fascist, but that nothing Haya will do will compare in importance with the Indian uprising in southern Peru, Bolivia and northern Chile that will come in the near future. These conclusions most Latin American observers will accept.

JONATHAN MITCHELL.

Books in Brief

The World As I See It, by Albert Einstein. New York: Covici, Friede. 303 pages. \$2.50.

WHEN ENGAGED in the study of nature, our mind has to overcome the passive resistance of matter, plus its own biological limitations—and that is all. Patience, intelligence, intuition are enough. It takes a different sort of perspicacity to grasp the complexities of social and political life. Here, we have to deal not only with the difficulty of finding the general law behind a multiplicity of phenomena, but also with the distorted work of other minds: the unconscious inertia of tradition, as well as the deliberate ruses of our contemporaries. To understand modern politics, a pure mind is not half so good as a cynical mind; and Einstein is never anything but sincere and straight-minded. And that may explain why he does not seem to use his powerful intellect much outside his own domain. His writings, letters, articles and speeches as collected in "The World As I See It" surely show us the legend created by publicity, but dis-

picture of the universe, natural and social. To Einstein's credit it must be said that unlike many scientists who have recently made public utterances on political problems—not to mention the Prussian professors who now rush to Hitler—he never pretends to *think* when he only loves or hates. He emerges from this book as a man of great courage and honesty, who fights for his belated liberal opinions with a sympathetic intransigence.

N. G.

Revelations of a Prison Doctor, by Louis Berg. New York: Minton, Balch and Company. 255 pages. \$2.50.

Before the February exposé, Welfare Island Penitentiary was a complete congress of hells. Politically ridden from outside and gang-ruled within, the "world's worst prison" inbred the abuses it was meant to correct. It married emotional starvation to idleness; dumped dope addicts, perverts, paranoiacs, juvenile and recidivist convicts on a fagot-pile of abuse, extortion, degeneracy—and fired the mess with a \$500,000 annual dope traffic. Countenanced by paid officials, convicts organized the prison, stole and bootlegged supplies, sold every criminal utility—gambling, dope, disease, liquor, parole—to their solvent fellows. Books from the prison library cooked neatly buttered steaks. Syphilitic perverts in evening gowns held open cell. Meanwhile the run of prisoners went without the bread and cursed the crumbs. Dr. Berg's "Revelations" of this incidental flower of the C.O.D. genius of Tammany Hall run quietly and earnestly beneath an air of enormous understatement.

P. W.

Facts and Theories of Psychoanalysis, by Ives Hendrick. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 331 pages. \$3.

Dr. Hendrick is an uncompromising Freudian and in this

his first book he undertakes to make clear to the layman the beliefs and therapeutic practices of his mentor. This he does more satisfactorily than most of his confrères. He also gives a brief resume of the important changes in the psychoanalytic method and of its present status, together with short criticisms of the unorthodox practices of Adler, Jung and Rank. Primarily, however, Dr. Hendrick is neither a historian nor a critic, but a practising physician; and so persistently does he keep this attitude that he manages to present an uncannily accurate picture of those strange conversational rituals that actually take place behind the closed doors of an analyst's private office. If you cannot decide whether or not to have yourself psychoanalyzed, this book should help you in making up your mind—if not in one way, then certainly in another.

G. A.

With Naked Foot, by Emily Hahn. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company. \$2.

This novel about the Congo is as good as it is unusual. It tells the story of Mawa, a Congolese woman, and of the various white "masters" for whom in turn she was housekeeper and mistress. The first, Fernandez, was the father of Joachim, the child Mawa had wanted and passionately loved. When Fernandez went back to Teneriffe, however, he suddenly remembered that Joachim was a white man's son and sent him away from Mawa to the Catholic mission school. Nothing her several white masters did really mattered to her after that, since she lived near the mission and saw Joachim daily. After she had stolen the child and run away with him to Nazibu's village, there was Adam Kemp, the sensitive, idealistic American school teacher. He was *Bwana Good*, the natives' friend, and

The first book frankly facing relationships not even supposed to exist:

The SEX LIFE of the UNMARRIED ADULT

EDITED BY IRA S. WILE, M.D.

The contributors include Margaret Mead, Robert L. Dickinson, Ernest R. Groves, Mary Beard, Robert Morss Lovett, Lorine Pruette, N. W. Ingalls, Ernest W. Burgess, Morris L. Ernst and Horace M. Kallen. 320 pages. Large 12mo.

This book answers, frankly and courageously, such questions as:

- What percentage of men and women have sex experience before marriage?
- On purely physiological grounds, is there any reason why temperate sex intercourse should be denied to the unmarried?
- What is the average normal periodicity of sex functioning in adults?
- What are the dangers to an unmarried couple in arousing, but not fulfilling, physical desire?
- What problems face young couples who delay marriage for economic reasons?
- Is the proportion of illegitimate births increasing despite widespread knowledge of contraception?
- Is homosexuality common among unmarried women?
- Is a marriage in which there has been pre-marital sexual intercourse more likely or is it less likely to go to smash?
- When does normal "sex play" impinge upon the abnormal?
- What percentage of unmarried persons indulge in auto-erotic practices?
- Can fundamental urges be repressed without a deleterious effect on one's personality?

Physicians and psychologists have given specific information and help to married persons with "legalized" sex lives. But this is the first authoritative, popularly written counsel to answer the problems of a group compelled to delay the legal solution of their difficulties.

V

"A much needed, candid, and sane discussion of one of the most important social and moral problems of the day. The book should create a real stir."

—HARRY ELMER BARNES

Please mail this to your bookseller, or to:
THE VANGUARD PRESS
100 Fifth Avenue, N. Y. C.

R-F

Gentlemen—Enclosed please find \$.....for copies at \$2.65 each (\$2.50 for each book plus 15 cents postage and handling) of THE SEX LIFE OF THE UNMARRIED ADULT.

☐ Please send C. O. D.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kindest of all; he never struck her. But in the end he was the most cruel, for when he found her with Yafali he wouldn't understand, but had the child put beyond her reach and himself went away. Emily Hahn tells the story with quiet realism and great skill, in a stripped, simple prose that is impressive and moving.

M. G.

Castaway, by James Gould Cozzens. New York: Random House. \$1.75.

This little novel, described by the publishers as "a frank horror story," is about a man who, finding himself in a deserted but completely stocked department store, has reason to believe he is the only person left alive in the world. What happens to him is Mr. Cozzens' story. Those who read the author's "S.S. San Pedro" will remember the way he built up to a dramatic climax through prolonged, admirably sustained, suspense, and in this book he turns the trick again. It moves with the sureness, the forethought and the deliberateness of a smooth, well manufactured movie. It gains much, as a thriller, from its frank manufacture, but it loses, as a serious piece of writing, more than it gains.

H. B.

Contributors

PEGGY BACON's portrait of John Strachey is the second in the series she is doing for The New Republic. She is now in Washington, where she is reporting facts about the faces of certain New Dealers.

IRVING KOLODIN is a member of the music staff of The New York Evening Sun. He has contributed articles on musical subjects to a number of magazines and has taught in the Theory Department of the Institute of Musical Art in New York.

HORACE GREGORY is the author of "Pilgrim of the Apocalypse," a critical study of D. H. Lawrence, and of two volumes of poetry, "Chelsea Rooming House" and "No Retreat."

NORBERT GUTERMAN is a native of France who is in this country observing social conditions. He is one of the editors of *Avante-Post*, a French critical review.

JONATHAN MITCHELL is one of the regular contributors to The New Republic. He is the author of "Goose Steps to Peace" and has written on political and economic subjects for many magazines.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Norbert Guterman, Paul Wren, Grace Adams, Martha Gruening and Hamilton Basso.

THE THEATRE GUILD presents
MAXWELL ANDERSON'S play

VALLEY FORGE

with PHILIP MERIVALE

GUILD THEATRE, 52nd Street, West of Broadway.
Evenings 8:40. Matinee, Thurs. and Sat. 2:40

S. N. BEHRMAN'S play

RAIN FROM HEAVEN

with JANE COWL
and JOHN HALLIDAY

GOLDEN THEATRE, 45th Street, West of Broadway
Evenings 8:30. Mats. Thurs. and Sat. 2:30

THEATRE UNION'S NEW HIT

SAILORS of CATTARO

"Congratulations! One of the best things in town."
—Stark Young, *New Republic*
"A genuinely fine play and an exciting one."—*World Telegram*.

CIVIC REPERTORY THEATRE, 14 St. and 6th Ave.
Prices: 30c to \$1.50 — Evs 8:45 — Mats. TUES. & SAT., 2:45

JANUARY 11th
9 p. m. to 2 a. m.

HOTEL DELANO
108 West 43rd St.

NEW MASSES BIRTHDAY PARTY

Come and celebrate with us the first year
of NEW MASSES as a weekly magazine!

Delano Band -:- Dancing

Floor show arranged by Workers Laboratory Theatre

BEN GOLDSTEIN—Master of Ceremonies

Admission:
75c in advance
\$1.00 at the door

Tickets on sale:
New Masses, 31 E. 27th St.
Workers' Bookshop, 50 E. 13th St.

Reservations by phone: CAledonia 5-3076

STARS OF STAGE AND SCREEN
WILL APPEAR AND PERFORM AT A

FRIDAY EVENING
JANUARY 18th

GALA ENTERTAINMENT and DANCE

TWO
ORCHESTRAS

HEYWOOD BROWN

Master of Ceremonies

SAVOY BALLROOM

Lenox Ave—140th Street

DANCING
UNTIL 8

TICKETS, 75c at: N. Y. U. Bookstore;
Columbia U. Bookstore;
New Masses, 31 East 27th Street.

AUSPICES: Comm. Support
League of Struggle for Negro
Rights and Marine Workers' Comm.

LECTURES

COOPER UNION Dept. of Social Philosophy

(Formerly The People's Institute)
IN THE GREAT HALL
8th Street and Astor Place—At 8 o'clock
Admission Free

Friday, January 18th

EVERETT DEAN MARTIN
"The Psychology of American Nationalism."

Sunday, January 20th

DOCTOR HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
"What Can We Believe of the Old Religions?"

Tuesday, January 22nd

DOCTOR HENRY J. FRY
"The Biological Control of Man."

HELP WANTED

...and culture in a stenog-

BOOKS

Another Book Published by the RATIONAL LIVING LIBRARY:

MENTAL HEALTH (How to stay healthy mentally. How to prevent mental troubles. What is Mind Disturbance? Sex and Mind. Social Conditions and Mental State, Mental Health and Marriage, Examples from Life.) Very practical. The best popular book on the subject; 160 pages; 40c a copy. (Send no stamps.)

Learn to live rationally. Stay healthy, prevent disease. We recommend no doctors, institutions or drugs. Our author, a well-known medical man and health teacher, prefers to suppress his name.
(Send no stamps; make checks and money-orders payable to:)

Address: RATIONAL LIVING
Box 4, Station M—New York

POSITION WANTED

MAN, 25, M.A. wants something real to do. Especially interested in movie publications, psychiatry

GRAMOPHONE RECORDS

MUSIC LOVERS—100,000 of the finest records in the world on sale at 50c & 75c per record (value \$1.50 & \$2). The Symphonies, Chamber Music, Operas, etc., of BACH, BEETHOVEN, BRAHMS, MOZART, WAGNER, etc. MAIL ORDERS, CATALOGUE, THE GRAMOPHONE SHOP, Inc., 18 E. 48th St., New York City.

ORANGES FOR SALE

Oranges, sweet, juicy, sun-ripened on trees; picked, shipped same day. Delivered express prepaid, \$3.50 bushel basket. Tangerines, \$3.75; Grapefruit, \$3.00. Satisfaction guaranteed. A. H. Burket, Sebring, Fla.

MAGAZINES

BETTER TIMES—the news weekly which covers all the health and welfare activities in the metropolitan New York district tersely and accurately. Sample copies upon request.

BETTER TIMES